DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 984 TM 006 535

TITLE	Longitudinal Evaluation of Selected Features of the National Follow Through Program. Appendix B: Parent Interview Survey, 1969-70. Draft.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Research Inst., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SRI-P-7370
PUB DATE	Mar 71
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-522480-4633(100)
NOTE	121p.; For related document, see ED 057 266 and 267
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education Programs; Demography; Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary School Students; Evaluation Methods; Followup Studies; Interviews; *National Surveys; *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Influence; *Parent Participation; Parent School Relationship; Parent Student Relationship; Primary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

The design of the 1969-70 Parent Interview (PI) survey specified that interviews be taken with the parents of children in Follow Through classes and with those of children in comparison classes of non-Follow Through children. A total of 14,833 interviews were conducted between January and March 1970 by the National Opinion Research Center in 49 communities with 67 Follow Through projects under 20 sponsors. Within the overall evalution, the PI survey served four main purposes: to examine the comparability of Follow Through and Non-Follow Through children; to determine the effectiveness of Follow Through for different demographic subgroups; to investigate parent attitudes and actions as mediators of the effectiveness of school programs; and to measure parent awareness of, participation in, and satisfaction with Follow Through. This report seeks to evaluate levels of parent involvement by comparisons of Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents, holding constant the levels of poverty and aggregating over all sponsors and grade levels. The remainder of the report is devoted to analysis and interpretation of data relating to selected measures of parent awareness, participation, influence, and satisfaction. (Author/MV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144984

DRAFT

TM

LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF SELECTED FEATURES OF THE NATIONAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

Appendix B: Parent Interview Survey, 1969–70

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared for:

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Menlo Park, California 94025 · U.S.A.

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Menlo Park, California 94025 · U.S.A.

March 1971

LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF SELECTED FEATURES OF THE NATIONAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

Appendix B: Parent Interview Survey, 1969–70

Prepared for

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

CONTRACT OEC-0-8-522480-4633(100)

SRI Project 7370

PREFACE

The ultimate goal of Follow Through is to increase the opportunities for poor children to have self-confident, productive, constructive lives. The Follow Through program was established through the U.S. Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity to sustain and supplement in the early grades the gains made by low income children who have a full year's experience in a Head Start or comparable preschool program. The program is administered by the U.S. Office of Education under a delegation of authority from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The environment in which a child lives and the persons with whom the child interacts all affect the child in complex ways to influence his development and his life chances. Because of these complex personal, social, and environmental interactions, the Follow Through program has many components:

(1) Instructional activities

(2) Health care and nutrition

(3) Psychological, social, and guidance services

(4) Advisory council participation that includes representation from parents of Follow Through children

(5) Participation by community agencies

(6) Provision for use of nonprofessional and volunteer workers

(7) Program of staff development

(8) Parental involvement activities.

This appendix is part of a progress report on SRI activities in support of the total Follow Through program. A complete list of progress reports follows:

LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF SELECTED FEATURES OF THE NATIONAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM (Overall Title)

Main Report: carries overall title only

Appendix A: Appendix to the main report

Appendix B: Parent Interview Survey

Appendix C: Teacher and Classroom Aide Survey

Appendix D: Issues in Noncognitive Measurement

Appendix E: Classroom Observation

Appendix F: Case Studies, 1969-70

Appendix G: (Not assigned)

Appendix H: Program Description (11 volumes)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of persons in the Office of Education have been involved in the parent interview survey. Dr. Robert L. Egbert, Director of the Follow Through Branch Program, and Dr. Richard Snyder, Chief of Research and Evaluation, Follow Through Program, have given guidance on overall design and content. Dr. Judith Crooks has given guidance throughout this work and has also been responsible for dealing with community problems as the survey was put into the field. Mr. Donald Burnes offered advice and support. The Follow Through Project Officers, under the direction of Laurence Wyatt, were helpful in identifying and solving community problems.

The interview form used in the survey is the product of many discussions and meetings involving many persons. Special thanks and recognition are due: Edward J. Barnes, Wesley Becker, Donald Bushell, Ronald Henderson, Robert Hess, Eleanor Maccoby, Douglass Price-Williams, and Manuel Ramirez.

Some of the specific content of the interview form is drawn from other sources. Most of the items on life style were drawn directly from the work of Ronald Henderson. Certain other items were drawn from the Rotter Internality-Externality Scale,* modified for the present purpose. The items on parents' feeling of control over the school were developed primarily by Robert Hess.

The National Opinion Research Center conducted the field work, edited and coded the answers, and prepared the data for computer processing. Mrs. Pearl Zinner gave overall direction and guidance for the NORC effort.

Charles Y. Glock assisted in planning and reviewing the present report.

---

* Rotter, J. B., Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1966 pp. 1-28.

The SRI project staff has the ultimate responsibility for the questionnaire, its administration, and the analysis. Many SRI people made contributions along the way; major contributions were made by:

Stanley C. Crockett*

Harvey L. Dixon

Ocea C. Goldupp*

Martin Gorfinkel

Phyllis Hamilton

John Harris

Harry V. Kincaid

Diane Kirk

Karen B. Lee

Irene Longwell

Jean Lotridge

William G. Madow

Margaret C. Needels

Gertrude D. Peterson

Michael Rogson

Linda Simpson

Philip H. Sorensen

Dorothy E. Stewart

Kenneth A. Wesson

Annabelle Yip.

---

* No longer at SRI.

CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

I INTRODUCTION 1

Background 1
Purposes of the Parent Interview Survey 3
Survey Methodology 5
Analytical Approach 6

II PARENT AWARENESS 8

Child's School Program 8
Groups and Organizations that Work with the Schools 10
Policy Advisory Committee 12
Discussion 14

III PARENT PARTICIPATION 15

Classroom Visits 15
Work in the Classroom 18
Private Talks Between Parents and Teachers 20
Private Talks with Non-Teaching School Personnel 23
Parent Involvement with the PAC 25
Discussion 27

IV PARENT INFLUENCE 29

Parents' Own Influence 29
PAC Influence 30
Discussion 33

V PARENT SATISFACTION 34

Helpfulness of Follow Through to Child 34
Child's Progress in School 35
Likes and Dislikes Regarding the Follow Through Program . . . 38
Discussion 45

CONTENTS

VI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 47

Summary 47
Awareness 48
Participation 49
Influence 49
Satisfaction 50
Conclusions 50

Annex B-1 EXTRACTS FROM THE FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM GUIDELINES 53

Annex B-2 PROCEDURES USED IN THE PARENT INTERVIEW SURVEY 60

Annex B-3 BIBLIOGRAPHY 78

TABLES

1	Awareness of Child Being in Follow Through	9
2	Awareness of Groups and Organizations that Work with the Schools	11
3	Awareness of the PAC	13
4	Visits to Classrooms	16
5	Frequency of Classroom Visits	17
6	Person Suggesting Classroom Visit	18
7	Work in Child's Classroom	19
8	Volunteer or Paid Work in Child's Classroom	20
9	Private Talks with Teacher	21
10	Regency of Private Talks with Teacher	22
11	Location of Private Talks with Teacher	22
12	Private Talks with Non-Teaching Personnel in Child's School	24
13	Private Talks with Non-Teaching Personnel in Child's School, by Type of Personnel	24
14	Parent Membership in PAC and Attendance at PAC Meetings	26
15	Parents' Feelings of Influence and Control of Schools	31
16	Parent Opinion of the PAC's Effectiveness	31
17	Parents' Views on Influence of PAC in Selected Issues	32
18	Helpfulness of Follow Through to Child	35
19	Satisfaction with Child's Progress in School	36
20	Parents' Views on Type of School Change Needed for Increased Satisfaction	37
21	Positive Comments Made About Follow Through	39
22	Negative Comments Made About Follow Through	42

TABLES

B-2-1 Location and Total Number of Parent Interviews 62

B-2-2 Characteristics of the Parent Interview Sample, by Sponsor Group and Poverty Classification 64

B-2-3 Number of Respondents, by Child's Grade Level and Interview Form Completed 66

B-2-4 Basic Demographic Characteristics--10,373 Households . . . 67

B-2-5 Basic Demographic Characteristics--5,444 Households 67

I INTRODUCTION

Background

Although there is little agreement in the literature about the nature and types of family influence that are most important in childhood learning, there is general agreement among educators, researchers, program planners, and legislators that the child's family must be taken into account in any successful compensatory education program.*

The Follow Through program was founded on the proposition that involvement of parents in the educational process is a vital component of compensatory education for poor children. The Economic Opportunity Act is explicit concerning parent involvement. For example, the 1967 amendments to the Act specify that Follow Through be:

> . . . designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities . . . which the director finds will aid in the continued development of children in their full potential . . . (Section 222 A)

The preface to the Follow Through Program Guidelines issued by the U.S. Office of Education (OE) states explicitly that:

> . . . each potential Follow Through community must give clear evidence that it will implement and support processes leading to . . . the direct participation of the parents of Follow Through children in the development, conduct, and overall direction of the project . . . (p. ii)

---

* A short bibliography of relevant literature is presented as the final annex to this report.

The Guidelines contain other emphatic references to parent participation:*

> A basic tenet of Follow Through is that parents have both the right and the responsibility to share in determining the nature of their children's education. Accordingly, parents must be given opportunities to take an active role in all aspects of Follow Through . . . (p. 5)

Some of the opportunities for parent participation are defined in detail:

> Every Follow Through project must have a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) of which at least fifty percent of the members must be elected from among low-income parents of children in Follow Through. . . . A chairman should be elected from among the Follow Through parents on the committee and should schedule frequent meetings of the PAC. The PAC must have the right to set its own agenda. . . . (p. 6)

In view of the importance of parent participation, it was necessary that the SRI longitudinal evaluation of the national program gather information about the Follow Through parents, their role in the program, and its effects upon them. Therefore, a parent interview (PI) survey was designed and conducted as part of the total evaluation. The survey sought to identify those characteristics of the parents and the home situation which appear related to the educational progress of the child, and those parent attitudes and behaviors which might change over time as a consequence of Follow Through's program of planned variation.†

---

* All the direct references in the Guidelines to parent participation are presented as Annex B-1 of this report.

† "Under the Follow Through national program design of planned variation, local projects are expected to enter into an arrangement with an approved program sponsor to implement a particular approach to the education and development of young, low-income children" (Follow Through Guidelines, p. 12). A more detailed discussion of sponsors and their approaches is in the Main Report.

Purposes of the Parent Interview Survey

Within the overall evaluation, the PI survey serves four main purposes:

(1) To Examine the Comparability of Follow Through and Non-Follow Through Children

The basic design of the longitudinal evaluation called for comparison of the growth and achievement of poor children in Follow Through with those of similar children not in Follow Through. Since random assignment was not possible, other means had to be used to discover any systematic differences between the two groups. The parent interviews were needed to check comparability so that, where differences were found to be significant, the variation could be investigated or more comparable subgroups of children could be selected for inclusion in the evaluation.

(2) To Determine the Effectiveness of Follow Through for Different Demographic Subgroups

Follow Through was designed to build upon whatever gains were achieved in Head Start or similar programs, and to consolidate these gains so that they would not be lost when the child entered the established school system. Once comparability between Follow Through and non-Follow Through children was either established or improved, it became possible to determine which groups of Follow Through children made the most academic progress by comparing them with their non-Follow Through equivalents. Although information relating to certain demographic variables is available from other sources, the parents are one of the best sources of information concerning their own education, income, and occupation. Parent interview data, therefore, can help determine whether it is the poorest children, with the least educated parents, who are being most effectively reached by Follow Through or whether, on the contrary, Follow Through works best for those children who already have more economic and educational advantages at home.

(3) To Investigate Parent Attitudes and Actions as Mediators of the Effectiveness of School Programs

It may prove to be true, for example, that a Follow Through program will be effective or especially effective in improving children's academic skills only if the parents are sufficiently engaged in the school program to be able to support at home what goes on in the classroom. Some Follow Through programs are specifically designed to bring about a considerable degree of parent involvement and parent education while others emphasize these goals only minimally.

The parent interviews provide data on:

- The amount of home support given to the child's academic activities (e.g., help with homework, talking about school activities)
- "Life style" variables (e.g., the amount of reading the parents do at home, socializing with other families, taking child on trips)
- Parent feelings of self-esteem and effectiveness in dealing with the schools and other institutions that affect their lives.

Some of the Follow Through programs are designed to bring about change in these aspects of the children's home lives and thus indirectly to facilitate their readiness for school learning. Once information on such factors as the above is available, children can be grouped accordingly, to determine whether there are greater academic gains for those children whose parents have been successfully reached.

(4) To Measure Parent Awareness of, Participation in, and Satisfaction with Follow Through

The Follow Through program provides a wide variety of opportunities for parent involvement within its framework of planned variation. Thus, the following indicators of parent involvement were investigated:

- Awareness of child's school program and related activities
- The extent of participation in the child's program (e.g., visits to the school, service in the classroom, and involvement with the PAC)
- Feelings of influence on the school system
- Satisfaction with the child's school program.

This report presents the results only of those interview questions in subject areas directly related to the fourth and last purpose described above; it also describes (in summary below and in detail in Annex B-1) the methodology for the PI survey as a whole. Much of the data gathered in the survey relate to the other three purposes and are incorporated in the Main Report of the present series.

Survey Methodology

The design of the PI survey specified that interviews be taken with the parents of children in Follow Through classes and with those of children in comparison classes of non-Follow Through children. Targets were set in such a way that there would be about three interviews with Follow Through parents for each two interviews with non-Follow Through parents. Interviewing was confined to those families whose children were being tested by SRI for achievement so that interrelationships between parent variables and the children's achievement scores could be analyzed.

A total of 14,833 interviews* were conducted between mid-January and mid-March 1970 by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in 49 communities with 67 Follow Through projects under 20 sponsors. (It should be noted here that sponsors ordinarily have projects in several communities.) Parents of children first entering school (either at the kindergarten or the first-grade level) and already in school (grade one or grade two) were interviewed. Owing to difficulties in matching identifying data and other administrative problems, 775 children scattered

---

* Included in this total are 3,685 parents of non-Follow Through children in grade four who were interviewed (with the short form described in the next paragraph) to provide a comparison group for the present Follow Through children when they reach the fourth grade.

throughout the sample communities whose parents were interviewed were not included in the second round of achievement testing (Spring 1970) and, to simplify all the analyses, these interviews have been excluded. The final effective sample therefore totaled 10,373.

Two interview forms were designed, a "long" and a "short" form. The latter, used in about two-thirds of all the interviews conducted, was used primarily to obtain demographic data for analysis of family characteristics of possible relevance to school performance. There were 4,929 short-form interviews--3,225 Follow Through parents and 1,704 non-Follow Through of children in kindergarten through second grade--the data from which are used in other analyses.

The long interview was limited to about one-third of the total sample and included extensive additional questioning on matters of particular relevance to this report, namely, questions about parents' awareness, participation, influence, and satisfaction with the program. The present report is thus based on this sample of 5,444 parents--3,601 parents of Follow Through children and 1,843 parents of non-Follow Through children.

Copies of the two interview forms are found in Annex B-2 which also includes a complete description of the survey procedures.

The response rate in this first round of interviewing was unusually high; NORC was able to locate 95% of the target families and to complete the interview with a parent in 97% of these cases. Between 15% and 25% of the interviews in each area were verified, either by phone or mail.

Analytical Approach

The data presented in this report, being the result of a single survey, cannot produce direct evidence concerning change since there are no comparable measurements before Follow Through, nor are there as yet measurements at two points of time. This first PI survey, however, does provide evidence useful in estimating the effects of Follow Through upon parents, in particular as they relate to parent awareness, participation, influence, and satisfaction. First, these measurements of involvement within the Follow Through parent group itself give some indication of what Follow Through has achieved. Second, Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents can be compared on some of these same measures since the comparison groups were selected in each Follow Through project location to represent the same population of parents. Therefore, some

tentative conclusions about the changes in parent behavior can be made by assuming that the non-Follow Through parents represent a pre-Follow Through group of parents.

One of the standard tools of analysis in this report is a classification of all respondents by three levels: Certain Poverty, Possible Poverty, and Not Poverty. The Follow Through program is concerned with low-income families and defines "low-income" strictly according to the poverty guidelines set forth for FY 1969 by the Office of Economic Opportunity (see Annex B-2). Some of the families in the Follow Through as well as in the non-Follow Through groups covered in the parent interviews do not meet this poverty definition and have therefore been classified as "Not Poverty" throughout the analyses. Those that did meet the OEO definition are designated as "Certain Poverty"; the third analytical category is identified as "Possible Poverty" and includes those respondents who could not be classified unambiguously under "Certain" or "Not." Very few families included in the survey would be considered as other than poor by any definition less strict than the OEO's; nevertheless, there is compelling justification for reporting the results separately for these poverty categories so that we may judge Follow Through's relative success in serving the "most poor."

The analyses to follow are based on data aggregated over all sponsors and grade levels. Sponsors are not analyzed individually since many of their projects were still in early stages of development when the [illegible] survey was conducted and detailed analyses would be inappropriate at this time. However, data on the range of sponsor variation are presented as indicators of the potential levels of involvement that can be achieved. Grade levels are not analyzed separately because of the small number of cases in some grades. For example, the children of 86% of the parents responding were either in kindergarten or entering the first grade. Of the remaining respondents, 533 (9.9%) were parents of non-entering first grade and 199 (3.7%) of second grade--too few cases for detailed tabulations.

In summary, this report seeks to evaluate levels of parent involvement by comparisons of Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents, holding constant the levels of poverty and aggregating over all sponsors and grade levels. The remainder of the report is devoted to analysis and interpretation of data relating to selected measures of parent awareness, participation, influence, and satisfaction.

II PARENT AWARENESS

The awareness of parents exposed to experimental programs such as Follow Through is of obvious importance. Without at least minimal knowledge of program operation, parents cannot become involved in any meaningful way--and without involvement, it seems unlikely that the parent will perceive that he has an opportunity to do something different with respect to the child and his school.

Child's School Program

It might be supposed that all parents whose children are enrolled in Follow Through would be able to report this minimum information. This is not, however, the case.

One of the first substantive questions asked each respondent was whether the "sample child" was in a special school program. Those who answered "yes" were then asked to name the program (with no prompting from the interviewer). Those parents of Follow Through children who were able to identify Follow Through as their child's school program were counted as having "awareness without prompting."

Respondents who did not immediately identify their child's school program were later prompted by questions asking if they had ever heard of Follow Through and if so, whether their child was enrolled in it. The Follow Through parents who answered "yes" to both of these questions were classified as having "awareness with prompting."

Table 1 presents the results of these questions. Over half of all Follow Through parents were able to report spontaneously that the child was in the program and another 12.5% remembered that the child was in the program when prompted by the mention of Follow Through. The level of awareness was substantially lower for the Certain than for the Possible and Not poverty groups.

Table 1

AWARENESS OF CHILD BEING IN FOLLOW THROUGH*
(Percent of FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty	Possible Poverty	Not Poverty	All FT Parents
Awareness without prompting	46.5%	55.4%	57.3%	52.3%
Awareness with prompting	13.1	12.3	11.8	12.5
Total number	(1,436)	(856)	(1,168)	(3,460)

* This Table is derived from responses to several separate questions.
Awareness without prompting was taken from:

Question 1D. Is (person) in school? (If response was "yes" and person was under 12 years, Question 1E was asked.)

Question 1E. Is (child) in any special school program? (If response was "yes," Question 1F was asked.)

Question 1F. What is the name of the program?

Awareness with prompting was derived from:

Question 1G. Is (child) in a program called Head Start or one called Follow Through? (If response was "no," Question 3 was asked.)

Question 3. Before this interview, had you ever heard of Follow Through? (If response was "yes," Question 4 was asked.)

Question 4. Is (sample child) in Follow Through?

The summary figures reported in Table 1 cover considerable variation between sponsors in the amount of parental awareness their programs generate. As indicated below, variation in total awareness extends dramatically, from highs of over 90% to a low of 26%:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	90.9%	37.2%
Possible	95.2	36.2
Not	90.2	26.4

Groups and Organizations that Work with the Schools

Parent awareness of groups and organizations that work with schools indicates knowledge of some of the social and political factors that bear on the school system. In this connection, both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents were asked, "Are there any groups of parents or organizations in your community that work with the schools?" and, if yes, "Who are they?"* It is then possible to see whether parents of Follow Through children are more or less aware than non-Follow Through parents. Table 2 summarizes the responses.

Overall, 50.4% of the Follow Through parents are aware of some group that works with the schools. Comparatively, only 41.4% of the non-Follow Through parents have such a knowledge, a difference significant at the .001 level.† The difference is to be explained, however, largely as a result of many Follow Through parents mentioning PAC (see next table) whereas, understandably, only a few non-Follow Through parents did. Consequently, a conclusion in this instance that Follow Through was more successful in generating awareness is not warranted.

Awareness is related to poverty level, and among both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents, there is a distinct trend to greater awareness as poverty diminishes.

---

* The groups coded by the interviewer included the PTA, Community Action program, the Policy Advisory Committee for Follow Through, and others specified by the respondents.

† Chi square is used as the test of significance throughout this report. The distributions being compared have been considered "different" when the value of the chi square has been less than .05.

Table 2

AWARENESS OF GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS THAT WORK WITH THE SCHOOLS
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Aware of some group that works with schools	42.0%	30.0%	46.8%	42.6%	63.4%	50.1%	50.4%	41.4%
Not aware of any group that works with schools	58.0	70.0	53.2	57.4	36.6	49.9	49.6	58.6
Total number	(1,347)	(601)	(804)	(350)	(1,096)	(745)	(3,247)	(1,696)

As shown below, there is not such sharp variation by sponsor in the levels of awareness of organizations that work with the schools as there was in the previous question:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	66.7%	31.7%
Possible	66.7	32.4
Not	75.0	44.0

The range extends from 75% for one sponsor to 32% for another.

Policy Advisory Committee

Awareness of the Policy Advisory Committee is, as noted above, something to be expected only of Follow Through parents. It reflects parent knowledge of one of the more important institutional mechanisms of the Follow Through program. It is through the PAC that the parent may, for the first time, have the opportunity to take an active role in the affairs of his child's school. While awareness does not necessarily lead to participation, it is obviously a prerequisite to such participation.

Parent awareness of the PAC was less, as might be expected, than awareness that one's child is in a Follow Through program as Table 3 indicates. Indeed, only 19.7% of the Follow Through parents mentioned PAC spontaneously when asked about groups or organizations they know which work with the schools. An additional 21% acknowledged knowing about PAC when asked specifically whether they had heard about it. Awareness is again shown to be related to poverty level, with the certain poverty parents being the least likely to reveal knowledge of the PAC.

Table 3

AWARENESS OF THE PAC*
(Percent of FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty	Possible Poverty	Not Poverty	All FT Parents
Awareness without prompting	15.9%	23.9%	20.6%	19.7% (N = 1,636)
Awareness with prompting	15.5	23.2	26.6	21.0 (N = 3,133)

* This table was derived from two separate questions: Question 23, "Are there any groups of parents or organizations in your community that work with the schools?" If the response was "yes" and the respondent mentioned PAC the answer was counted as "awareness without prompting." If "no," Question 24 was asked: "Have you heard of a group called the Policy Advisery Committee, sometimes called the P.A.C. or PAC?" If the response was "yes" it was classified as "awareness with prompting."

The range of sponsor variation is given below for both unprompted and and prompted awareness of the PAC:

	Unprompted Awareness		Prompted Awareness	
Poverty Level	High	Low	High	Low
Certain	33.0%	0%	30.8%	0%
Possible	46.9	10.5	51.5	10.7
Not	40.9	3.1	34.4	10.0

The spread between high and low is less striking than was the case in the other awareness variables. The high is just over 50% and the low is zero.

Discussion

The foregoing data indicate, in general, that the level of awareness of Follow Through parents is in the middle ranges. Without prompting, 52% were able to report that the child was in Follow Through and 17% that they knew of the PAC. With prompting, 12% were aware of their child being in Follow Through and 21% were aware of the PAC. On the only question where Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents can be compared--awareness of groups and organizations that work with the schools--the former showed significantly higher awareness. Generally, across the three measures, awareness is highest for the Not poverty group. Finally, there were large variations in the level of awareness among sponsors.

It is difficult to determine from the evidence available what might constitute a "satisfactory" level for any of the three awareness variables presented. It might be argued that the prevailing levels of awareness are adequate, given the fact that the particular programs had been installed a relatively short time when this survey was conducted, and approaches had not yet been refined. On the other hand, it could be argued that parent awareness is so crucial to the success of Follow Through that steps should be taken to increase the relatively low overall level of awareness found. The upper limits of awareness reached in some projects--as high as 95% in the case of knowing the child is in Follow Through--support the feasibility of this argument, although the factors responsible for such high levels of awareness are not yet known.

From a practical point of view, it is important to increase the level of parent awareness of the Follow Through program as a necessary first step toward increased parent participation: parents cannot participate if they are not aware of the program. As more parents learn of it, there will be greater opportunity for increased parent-teacher contact, parent visits to the classroom, and involvment of parents as paid or volunteer aides. Parent awareness is particularly important to the PAC, which was established hopefully as a means of bringing about effective parent involvement in the affairs of the school. Parents must become aware of its existence if they are to avail themselves of the opportunity to participate it affords.

Seen in the perspective of the total Follow Through program, parent awareness should be viewed as a necessary condition for parent participation. And parent participation has been accepted as a worthwhile goal.

III PARENT PARTICIPATION

The participation of parents in school activities is considered to be central to the success of Follow Through programs, and it is a "basic tenet" of Follow Through that all programs seek to generate such participation. The Follow Through Guidelines advocate a wide variety of parent participation activities. The PI survey included questions about visiting the classroom, working in the classroom, talking with the child's teacher, talking with non-teaching school personnel, and participation in the PAC, PTA, other school organizations and in non-school organizations.

Classroom Visits

Parents were asked, "Since the beginning of this school year, have you (or your husband) visited (child's) classroom while the class was in session?"# Table 4 shows the proportion of respondents visiting.

Judging from this evidence, Follow Through programs are more successful on the average in stimulating parent visits to classrooms than are non-Follow Through programs. The total figure for Follow Through is 48.8% and for non-Follow Through only 35.3%, a significant difference of 13.5 percentage points ($p < .001$). Follow Through's greater success is evident at each level of poverty ($p < .001$) but more so as the level of poverty diminishes. Interestingly, there is no difference to speak of in the extent of visits by non-Follow Through parents at different poverty levels.

In this instance, the extent of visits, by sponsor, spreads over an extremely large range for all poverty levels:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	68.2%	6.3%
Possible	66.7	20.7
Not	70.0	45.0

Most of the visits reported were by the respondent alone, in almost all cases the mother.

Table 4

VISITS TO CLASSROOMS
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Has visited classroom	43.4%	34.6%	47.4%	36.1%	56.4%	35.5%	48.8%	35.3%
Has not visited classroom	56.6	65.4	52.6	63.9	43.6	64.5	51.2	64.7
Total number	(1,347)	(618)	(796)	(357)	(1,083)	(774)	(3,226)	(1,749)

Variation of this amount, from 6.3 to 70.0 percent, is of unusual interest, and could reflect a wide variety of practices in the implementation and organization of the programs.

Follow Through parents are more likely not only to visit classrooms but to do so more frequently, as Table 5 shows. Among parents who had visited classrooms, 50% of the Follow Through as compared with 40% of non-Follow Through parents did so three or more times. This is a significant difference overall ($p < .001$), and the differences are significant at the .01 level or better for the Certain and Not poverty groups, but at less than the .05 level for Possible poverty. However, in the Follow Through group, there is a consistent tendency for the frequency of visits to increase as the level of poverty decreases.

Sponsor variation for the proportion of parents visiting three or more times is large, from 8% to 65%:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	57.6%	30.6%
Possible	60.9	38.3
Not	65.2	8.3

Table 5

FREQUENCY OF CLASSROOM VISITS
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents Visiting)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Visiting Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	MFT	FT	NFT
1 or 2 visits	53.5%	64.0%	50.0%	54.3%	46.2%	60.7%	49.8%	60.5%
3 or more visits	46.5	36.0	50.0	45.7	53.8	39.3	50.2	39.5
Total number	(585)	(214)	(377)	(129)	(611)	(275)	(1,573)*	(618)*

* 24.5% of FT and 13.9% of non-FT parents visited the class 3 or more times.

Table 6 reports on the person who initiated the classroom visits--the parent, teacher, or child or other. Here, the differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through are small, the outstanding finding for both being the extremely large percent of visits suggested by the parent. There is a consistent tendency for more parent-suggested visits among non-Follow Through parents and more teacher-suggested visits among Follow Through parents. While small, these differences suggest that, overall, there is more teacher initiated parent/school interaction in the Follow Through group. In both groups, there is a slight tendency toward parent rather than teacher initiation as the level of poverty declines.

Sponsor variation, as the ranges below indicate, is large (73 percentage points) for parent initiated visits and moderate (52 percentage points) for teacher initiated visits:

	Parent Initiated		Teacher Initiated	
Poverty Level	High	Low	High	Low
Certain	95.0%	39.1%	56.5%	5.0%
Possible	82.4	37.5	54.6	15.7
Not	88.0	22.2	40.7	4.0

Table 6

PERSON SUGGESTING CLASSROOM VISIT
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents Visiting)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Visiting Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Parent suggested	66.5%	67.4%	67.6%	74.8%	68.3%	76.1%	67.5%	73.0%
Teacher suggested	32.3	31.2	29.8	24.5	25.8	21.0	29.2	25.0
Child/ other	1.2	1.4	2.6	0.7	5.9	2.9	3.3	2.0
Total number*	(677)	(218)	(466)	(139)	(694)	(314)	(1,837)	(671)

*

Work in the Classroom

The Follow Through Guidelines urge that parents be given an opportunity to work in the classroom. Table 7 presents information that shows how few parents actually work in the child's classroom.

Very few parents work in the child's classroom--only 19.0% of Follow Through and 8.9% of non-Follow Through parents reported doing so ($p < .001$) However, this difference between Follow Through and non-Follow Through is statistically significant for all three poverty groups ($p < .001$) and is an indication that Follow Through programs are relatively more successful in producing this kind of participation. As is by now coming to be a consistent pattern, parent action increases as poverty level declines.

Table 7

WORK IN CHILD'S CLASSROOM
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Does not work	85.7%	94.8%	80.4%	91.5%	75.7%	88.0%	81.0%	91.1%
Does work	14.3	5.2	19.6	8.5	24.3	12.0	19.0	8.9
Total number	(1,421)	(632)	(848)	(364)	(1,161)	(790)	(3,430)*	(1,786)*

* 6.3% of FT and 1.8% of non-FT parents worked for pay; 12.7% and 7.1% respectively, were volunteers.

The sponsor variation in the proportion of parents working is relatively small:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	27.6%	6.7%
Possible	35.0	0.0
Not	39.6	10.0

The foregoing data include parents who are paid to do work in the child's school and also those working as volunteers. Table 8 shows that the majority are volunteers--79.2% of the non-Follow Through and 66.7% of the Follow Through parents ($p < .005$). This pattern of difference holds for all levels of poverty although only for the Possible poverty group is the difference statistically significant (better than the .05 level). A larger proportion of the Certain poverty parents--both Follow Through and non-Follow Through--work as volunteers than do the Possible and Not Poverty parents. The Possible group exceeds both the Certain and Not Poverty groups among parents working for pay. At all levels of poverty, more Follow Through than non-Follow Through parents work for pay ($p < .005$).

Table 8

VOLUNTEER OR PAID WORK IN CHILD'S CLASSROOM
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents Working)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents Working	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Work as volunteer	73.4%	84.8%	57.8%	67.8%	67.0%	81.1%	66.7%	79.2%
Works for pay	26.6	15.2	42.2	32.2	33.0	18.9	33.3	20.8
Total number	(203)	(33)	(166)	(31)	(282)	(95)	(651)	(159)

Sponsor variation with respect to parents working for pay and as volunteers is large..

	Volunteer Work		Paid Work	
Poverty Level	High	Low	High	Low
Certain	88.2%	34.8%	65.2%	11.8%
Possible	50.0	41.2	58.8	50.0
Not	94.7	50.0	50.0	5.3

For volunteers, one sponsor reached a high of almost 95% contrasted with another where the low was 34.8%, a difference of about 60 percentage points. For paid parents, the range is the same but the high is only 65.2% and the low is 5.3%.

Private Talks Between Parents and Teachers

A parent talking privately with a child's teacher represents another behavioral indicator of his interest and involvement in education. The survey contained a series of questions concerning the occurrence, recency, and location of private talks between parent and teacher. Table 9 indicates that the majority of parents have talked with the child's teacher privately, but the majority is larger among the Follow Through (61%)

than non-Follow Through (56%) parents. This difference is significant ($p < .001$) and this pattern of significant differences ($p < .05$) holds for all levels of poverty. In both groups, talking with the teacher is negatively related with level of poverty: the more poverty, the less such talks occur.

Table 9

PRIVATE TALKS WITH TEACHER
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
No	50.4%	57.0%	37.2%	44.0%	24.1%	32.3%	38.2%	43.4%
Yes	49.6	43.0	62.8	56.0	75.9	67.7	61.8	56.6
Total number	(1,433)	(632)	(853)	(366)	(1,166)	(792)	(3,452)	(1,790)

Follow Through parents are not only more likely to have had a private talk with a teacher but also to have done so more recently. As Table 10 indicates, for parents who have had such talks, Follow Through parents at all levels of poverty are consistently more likely to report that talks occurred in the last month. The differences are statistically significant for the Certain poverty group ($p < .005$) and for the totals ($p < .001$), but not significant for the Possible and Not poverty groups. It is notable that, for the Follow Through parents, a larger proportion of Certain than Not poverty parents talked with the teacher within the past month, one of the infrequent instances where the Certain poverty exceeds the Not poverty group in behavior expected of Follow Through parents.

Most conversations, as might be expected, occur in school rather than in the home or elsewhere (see Table 11). Over 90% of both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents who have had such talks report having had them in the school. The differences are slight between these two groups and over levels of poverty. A slight tendency for home visits to occur more frequently with an increase in poverty level may be noted for Follow Through parents.

Table 10

RECENCY OF PRIVATE TALKS WITH TEACHER
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents Talking)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents Talking	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Within past month	45.3%	34.6%	45.9%	36.1%	40.3%	33.6%	43.4%	34.4%
Over a month ago	54.7	65.4	54.1	63.9	59.7	66.4	56.6	65.6
Total number	(711)	(272)	(536)	(205)	(885)	(536)	(2,132)	(1,013)

Table 11

LOCATION OF PRIVATE TALKS WITH TEACHER
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents Talking)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents Talking	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
School	88.7%	93.3%	91.9%	94.4%	92.0%	91.3%	90.9%	92.6%
Home	9.6	6.0	6.8	3.7	4.8	5.7	6.8	5.3
Other	1.7	0.7	1.3	1.9	3.2	3.0	2.3	2.1
Total number	(459)	(135)	(370)	(107)	(621)	(229)	(1,450)	(471)

Sponsor variation for the measures relating to parent talks with teachers is shown below:

Poverty Level	Had Talks		Recency Within Past Month		Location			
					Home		School	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Certain	79.3%	28.0%	65.3%	28.9%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	77.8%
Possible	89.2	39.4	67.2	20.7	20.0	0.0	92.9	80.0
Not	91.1	45.5	64.1	18.6	27.8	0.0	100.0	100.0

For one sponsor, over 90% of the parents reported having had a private talk with the teacher, compared with another, with a low of 28%. Of those parents having had such talks, there is variation from a high of 67.2% to a low of 18.6% in terms of recency of the talk. The variation is much less notable in the cases of talks being at home or at school.

Private Talks with Non-Teaching School Personnel

In addition to the questions about talks with teachers, parents were asked, "Have you (or your husband) talked privately with anyone else from (child's) school this year--either at home or at school?" Table 12 shows that in this respect, Follow Through parents are much more active than non-Follow Through parents at all poverty levels, with roughly 50% more of the former than the latter talking privately with school personnel other than teachers. The difference is statistically significant at each poverty level ($p < .001$). There is no orderly relation between poverty level and the occurrence of such talks.

Sponsor variation, as shown below, is extremely large:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	61.2%	8.3%
Possible	90.9	0.0
Not	55.4	18.9

For one sponsor, nine of ten parents have talked privately with non-teaching personnel. For another, none has had such talks.

Table 12

PRIVATE TALKS WITH NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN CHILD'S SCHOOL
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
No	66.4%	84.1%	69.4%	85.5%	68.1%	82.1%	67.7%	83.5%
Yes	33.4	15.5	30.0	14.2	31.6	17.8	32.0	16.2
Total number	(1,436)	(634)	(856)	(366)	(1,168)	(793)	(3,460)	(1,793)

There are also rather marked differences in who the Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents talked with. As Table 13 shows, non-Follow Through parents reported having talked with the principal more than twice as often (69%) as did Follow Through parents (29%). Follow

Table 13

PRIVATE TALKS WITH NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN CHILD'S SCHOOL, BY TYPE OF PERSONNEL
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents Talking)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents Talking	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Principal	22.3%	65.7%	25.8%	55.6%	42.5%	77.0%	29.9%	69.5%
Nurse, etc.	26.3	23.9	32.5	22.2	27.1	14.0	28.0	18.7
Social worker	40.5	4.4	27.1	11.1	18.2	5.0	29.9	5.9
Other	10.9	6.0	14.6	11.1	12.2	4.0	12.2	5.9
Total number	(274)	(67)	(151)	(36)	(214)	(100)	(639)	(203)

Through parents, in turn, are somewhat more likely to have talked with a school nurse and considerably more likely to have talked with a social worker. In general, these differences are sustained at each level of poverty. Among Follow Through parents, however, the tendency is for the principal to be the other participant in conversation as poverty level decreases. The reverse tendency occurs with respect to conversations with social workers: here it is the poorer Follow Through parent who is likely to report such conversations.

Parent Involvement with the PAC

Those parents who were aware of the PAC's existence were asked a series of questions relating to their membership status and attendance at PAC meetings.* The results are shown in Table 14. About 40% (N = 400) had been general members of PAC, and of that group 75% (N = 302) were members at the time the interview was taken. Over 50% (N = 519) of the parents aware of PAC had attended a PAC general meeting and about 33% (N = 252) had attended a PAC Executive Committee meeting.† Nearly 60% (N = 587) reported they knew another PAC member.

Of those parents reporting they were current members of PAC, about 60% (N = 257) were General Members, 19% (N = 77) Executive Committee members, and 17% (N = 72) members of both.

---

* The questions included:

Question 25. Have you (or your husband) ever been a member of PAC? (yes, no)
A. Are you (or your husband) now a member? (yes, no)
B. (Are/Were) you (or he) a general member of (are/were) you (or he) a member of the executive committee or both? (General member, Executive committee, Both)
Question 26. Have you (or your husband) ever gone to the PAC general meetings? (yes, no)
Question 27. Have you ever gone to the PAC Executive Committee meetings? (yes, no)
Question 28. Do you happen to know any members of PAC? (yes, no)

† The survey questionnaire included questions concerning whether or not parents could have gone to PAC General and Executive meetings, and the reasons why they didn't go. No analysis was made of these data because of the small number of cases.

Table 14

PARENT MEMBERSHIP IN PAC AND ATTENDANCE AT PAC MEETINGS
(FT Parents)

	"Yes"		"No"		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Respondent or spouse ever a member	400	39.6%	609	60.4%	1,009	100%
Respondent or spouse now a member	302	76.1	95	23.9	397	100
PAC member has attended a PAC meeting	358	36.6	621	63.4	979	100
Respondent or spouse ever gone to:						
PAC general meeting	519	51.7	484	48.3	1,003	100
PAC executive committee meeting	252	33.9	744	75.1	996	100
Respondent knows other members of PAC	587	58.5	417	41.5	1,004	100

The sponsor variation for the proportion of PAC members who had attended a PAC meeting is shown below:*

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	61.9%	20.5%
Possible	50.0	33.3
Not	40.4	30.8

* At the time this was written, sponsor variation for the remaining variables concerning parent involvement in the PAC were not available.

For one sponsor, over 60% of the PAC members had attended a meeting in contrast to another sponsor with only about 20% attending.

Discussion

It is clear that Follow Through exceeds non-Follow Through on all four measures of parent participation where comparison is possible--class visits, work in the classroom, private talks with the teacher, and private talks with other school personnel--and does so overall and also at all levels of poverty.

While there is a predominance of significant differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through, either for the total groups or by levels of poverty, the differences are typically small. It is, of course, the consistency of the tendency for Follow Through to exceed non-Follow Through parents on all of these measures of parent participation that suggests a pervasive, if modest, Follow Through effect.

There is a strong tendency for measures of participation to increase as poverty diminishes. This is true for class visits, work in the classroom, and talks with the teacher. Only in the case of talks with non-teaching personnel is this relation not present. Thus, typically, the participation levels are smallest for the main target group--the Certain poverty parents. Even so, the data are consistent in showing that even in that category, participation is greater among Follow Through than non-Follow Through parents.

The absolute levels of participation reflected by the indicators used differ, as would be expected, according to the type of participation. Parents working in the classroom was the most infrequently reported. In this case, the proportion of the total working as volunteers greatly exceeded those working for pay in both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parent groups. Private talks with non-teaching personnel are also relatively rare. In both cases, the proportion of participation is from about 10% to 30%. Classroom visits and talks with teachers were the most frequently reported activities, ranging somewhat above and below the 50% level.

The range of variation by sponsor is, in most cases, very dramatic. In all but the case of working in the classroom, the gap between the high and low exceeds 60 percentage points.

Parent involvement in the PAC typically involves a small proportion of the total Follow Through parents. When the proportions are calculated only for those parents that reported they were aware of the PAC, the level of involvement seems moderately high. It is of course an open question whether there would be more actual participation with the PAC if awareness were increased. In any event, the one variable for which a sponsor range is available--PAC members who had attended a PAC meeting, indicates that there is a wide range of involvement possible; in this instance, from 20% to 60%.

Parent participation, as with parent awareness, is difficult to evaluate in terms of whether Follow Through has been effective. Moreover, not until data become available at two points in time will it be possible to estimate Follow Through's contribution to changes in parent participation. Nevertheless, the levels of participation of various kinds found in this study, along with the wide differences in sponsor levels, suggest that interesting and effective experiments are in being. As more detailed information becomes available on experiments in parent participation at the community level, it will be possible to relate data from questionnaire surveys to actual program variables. In this way, clues can be derived as to approaches that can possibly be disseminated on a broad scale.

IV PARENT INFLUENCE

So far the discussion has concentrated on measures that reflect a variety of parent knowledge and actions. The emphasis has been on straightforward self-reports of awareness of various aspects of Follow Through and of actual participation in some of the activities available to the parent.

Closely related to these measures are the feelings that parents have about whether or not they have any real voice when decisions are made about the schools in their community. How parents feel in this respect can be a critical determinant of whether or not a parent can and will attempt to play a meaningful role in school affairs. If a parent has no confidence that school people care about his ideas, it is unlikely that he will persist in attempts to help the schools or to change them.

Parents' Own Influence

Measurement of parent feelings of this type are of course difficult, particularly with the necessarily brief questions that can be asked in a multi-purpose interview survey. Nevertheless, an attempt was made to explore this aspect of parent involvement by a series of items* directly related to parent influence:

Question 40: Now I would like to have your opinion on some statements about parents and schools. As I read the statements, tell me if you strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement.

A. There's nothing parents can do to change the schools.

B. In this community the parents have a say about how the schools are run.

C. If the parents disagree with the teacher or the principal, there's nothing parents can do about it.

---

* Developed primarily by Robert Hess.

D. In this community, people who run the schools really care about what parents think.

E. People who run the schools really know what the parents want.

F. If parent wanted something changed about the schools, there would be a great chance of getting it changed.

In the coding of the responses to these six statements, A and D were converted to positive statements. Thus, "strongly agree" represents the positive extreme on all items and "strongly disagree" the negative extreme.

Table 15 shows the results of these items summarized over all of them for a composite index of the extent to which parents feel that they have some influence and control over the schools. It is clear that there is a consistent tendency for Follow Through parents to have more feelings of influence than non-Follow Through parents. This tendency is particularly marked in the "strongly agree" category where, for all levels of poverty, there is a small difference between Follow Through (13.3%) and non-Follow Through (9.9%).* The differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through are less consistent in the "slightly agree" category, where the results are mixed and the differences in any event are small.

PAC Influence

Another approach to the measurement of influence centered on the PAC and the extent to which parents felt it could influence certain questions of school policy and program. The first of these questions asked the parents, "If you had a problem about the schools, could you get the PAC to try to do something about it (yes or no)?" As shown in Table 16, over 90% of those who were aware of the PAC expressed the belief that if the attempt was made, the PAC would act on problems of the schools. Moreover, this high level of confidence was expressed about equally by parents at all levels of poverty.

---

* Tests of significance and sponsor ranges are not presented because of the tentative nature of the evidence.

Table 15

PARENTS' FEELINGS OF INFLUENCE AND CONTROL OF SCHOOLS
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		Total	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Strongly agree	10.4%	5.7%	11.3%	8.5%	18.5%	14.0%	13.3%	9.9%
Slightly agree	60.8	58.9	62.2	59.6	60.6	63.3	61.1	61.0
Slightly disagree	27.2	34.3	24.9	29.4	19.5	21.6	24.0	27.7
Strongly disagree	1.7	1.1	1.6	2.5	1.5	1.1	1.6	1.4
Other	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2
Total number	(1,433)	(633)	(852)	(364)	(1,165)	(792)	(3,450)	(1,789)

Table 16

PARENT OPINION OF THE PAC'S EFFECTIVENESS
(Percent of FT Parents Aware of PAC)

	Certain Poverty	Possible Poverty	Not Poverty	All Aware FT Parents
Yes	91.1%	94.3%	92.4%	92.5%
No	8.9	5.7	7.6	7.5
Total number	(235)	(210)	(328)	(773)

Another series of questions concerning the PAC related to its perceived influence on the hiring of teachers and aides, the way the school's money is spent, the way that children are taught, and the extent to which the PAC and the school board usually work together in trying to solve school problems. Table 17 shows the results for these questions (Questions 33, 34, 35, 36).

Table 17

PARENTS' VIEWS ON INFLUENCE OF PAC IN SELECTED ISSUES*
(Percent of Aware FT Parents)

	"Yes"		"No"		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
PAC can influence:						
Working with school board to solve problems	688	89.8%	78	10.2%	766	100%
What children are taught	535	72.5	203	27.5	738	100
Hiring teachers and aides	420	62.6	269	37.4	689	100
Spending school money	431	61.8	266	38.2	697	100

* Percentages based on sum of "yes" and "no" responses to each question. Data by poverty level not available.

The data indicate that about 90% of those parents who are aware of the PAC had confidence in it as a means of working with the school board to solve school problems. About 75% had confidence in the PAC to influence what the children are taught in school, and about 60% felt that the PAC could influence the way the school's money is spent and the way teachers and aides are hired.

Discussion

As noted above, a parent's feelings of influence and control regarding his schools are clearly of fundamental importance to compensatory programs such as Follow Through. While it is acknowledged that the survey approach is unlikely to yield definitive conclusions concerning these types of parent feelings, the explorations made in this survey are suggestive.

The set of questions concerning parent influence did not strongly discriminate between Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents, although there is a consistent tendency for Follow Through parents to have more feelings of influence than non-Follow Through parents. The slight differences observed, while showing somewhat higher positive scores for Follow Through than non-Follow Through parents, were notable mainly for the preponderance (around 70%) of positive scores (i.e., "strongly" and "slightly" agree) on the part of both groups.

The perceptions of the parents who were aware of the PAC regarding its potential influence are remarkable in that there appears to be a very high confidence that the PAC can accomplish useful ends. Overall, about 90% of parents aware of the PAC think it can be an effective means of dealing with school problems. Additionally, from 60% to 90% feel the PAC could be influential on school issues such as hiring of teachers, spending school money, curricula, and working with the school board.

These findings on parent attitudes toward the PAC's ability to influence the school system are unusually suggestive of avenues for the expression of parental influence and involvement. The diverse approaches to the PAC offered by Follow Through may through further study, provide useful insights into the nature of parent influence and power.

Clearly, much more needs to be known about the dynamics of this problem. The ferment, tension, and controversy surrounding public education in recent years suggests an underlying public concern with how schools are organized, operated, and controlled. The current concern with accountability of school systems is reaching fad proportions, but it probably reflects serious public concern with the role of the parent and taxpayers in the affairs of the school.

V PARENT SATISFACTION

> School heads may feel that a survey of parent satisfaction-dissatisfaction represents a paramount need (p. 7) . . . . Even more acute is the necessity of identifying the specific practices or other conditions which are respectively associated with parent satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the schools (p. 12) . . . .*

Parent satisfaction with schools and with the child's performance in school has many dimensions. Feelings of satisfaction can derive from the high specific (e.g., lunch menus) or the very general (e.g., educational relevance to the real world). Outcomes of satisfaction or dissatisfaction can range from a friendly letter to the school superintendent, to overt hostility against school personnel.

For the purpose of this report a simple, straightforward set of indicators are used to measure parent satisfaction. These focus on:

- Helpfulness of Follow Through to child (asked of certain Follow Through parents only)
- Child's progress in school (asked of both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents)
- Type of changes needed for increased satisfaction (asked of both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents)
- "Likes" and "dislikes" related to the Follow Through program (asked of all the Follow Through parents).

Helpfulness of Follow Through to Child

Table 18 shows the responses to the question, "How helpful is Follow Through to (child)--would you say it is very helpful, somewhat helpful,

---

* Hand, H. C., "What People Think About Their Schools," World Book Company, New York, 1948: although not a recent work, the treatment of parent satisfaction is relevant and useful.

Table 18

HELPFULNESS OF FOLLOW THROUGH TO CHILD
(Percent of "Aware Without Prompting" FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty	Possible Poverty	Not Poverty	All "Aware" FT Parents
Very helpful	87.5%	85.0%	77.3%	83.3%
Somewhat helpful	11.7	14.1	19.6	15.1
Not at all helpful	0.8	0.9	3.1	1.6
Total number	(793)	(533)	(719)	(2,045)

or not helpful at all?" This question was asked only of those parents who with no prompting from the interviewer were able to state that the child was in a special program called Follow Through.

Overall, the percent of parents who felt the program is helpful to the child is extremely high: 85% of parents said that the program is very helpful and, combining the "very" and "somewhat" responses, over 98% of the parents in all levels of poverty stated that the Follow Through program is helpful. Differences by level of poverty are small, although there is a tendency for more Certain than Not poverty parents to consider Follow Through "very helpful."

Notable variation is found among sponsors. As shown below, the percentage of parents who felt that Follow Through had been "very helpful" ranges from 96.0% to 56.1%.

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	96.0%	75.0%
Possible	94.7	72.4
Not	91.2	56.1

Child's Progress in School

Both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents were asked, "In general, how satisfied are you with (child's) progress in school--are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, or are you not satisfied?" As shown

in Table 19, a generally high level of satisfaction dominated the responses of both groups. What small differences there are, however, reflect greater satisfaction on the part of Follow Through parents. (The differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through groups are significant overall ($p < .001$) and for the Possible ($p < .01$) and the Not ($p < .005$) poverty groups.) Combining the "very" and "fairly" satisfied responses produces a preponderance of positive attitudes--well over 90% of both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents at all levels of poverty.

Table 19

SATISFACTION WITH CHILD'S PROGRESS IN SCHOOL
(Percent of FT and Non-FT Parents)

	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty		All Parents	
	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT	FT	NFT
Very satisfied	78.7%	71.9%	79.1%	71.6%	74.5%	73.2%	77.4%	72.4%
Fairly satisfied	16.8	22.5	17.0	21.6	21.9	21.5	18.6	21.8
Not at all satisfied	4.5	5.6	3.9	6.8	3.6	5.3	4.0	5.8
Total number	(1,435)	(633)	(854)	(366)	(1,165)	(792)	(3,454)	(1,791)

Variation by sponsor is greater here than for the preceding question on helpfulness of Follow Through; the high for parents who felt very satisfied with their child's progress is 94.0%, the low is 60.0%:

Poverty Level	High	Low
Certain	94.0%	60.0%
Possible	87.8	63.4
Not	83.5	61.1

The 884 Follow Through and the 592 non-Follow Through parents who were only "fairly" or "not" satisfied with their child's progress in school were asked, "What would have to be different for you to be very satisfied?" Table 20 summarizes the respondents' first comment,

as coded into the seven subject categories listed. Since there were few cases in any of the seven coded categories except the first two, variations by level of poverty and the sponsor ranges were not computed.

Table 20

PARENTS' VIEWS ON TYPE OF SCHOOL CHANGE NEEDED FOR INCREASED SATISFACTION*
(Percent of "Fairly" or "Not" Satisfied Parents)

	FT	NFT
Child should change in some way	35.6%	38.5%
Academic emphasis	21.5	21.8
Discipline	7.5	4.7
Material sent home	7.5	7.1
School/home contacts	4.2	7.8
Fun and games at school	2.5	1.7
Other school work	1.7	2.7
Other	8.6	8.6
Don't know or no answer	11.0	7.1
Total number	(884)	(592)

* Variations by level of poverty and the sponsor range were not computed because of the small number of cases in each row.

More than a third of both the Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents made comments indicating their desires that the child would change in some way, usually unspecified, e.g., "He could do better." Both groups were also similar in their mentions of matters relating to academic emphasis: about 20% of the parents in each group mentioned such points, and the majority of these comments indicated a desire for more emphasis on the 3Rs of school work. Fewer than 10% of either Follow Through or non-Follow Through parents made comments that could be classified in the remaining categories and, again, the direction of comments was similar: more discipline, more or better materials sent home with the child, more school/home contacts, but less "fun and games" at school.

Likes and Dislikes Regarding the Follow Through Program

Some of the reasons behind the satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) noted above were sought in two open-ended questions* asked of parents who had heard of the Follow Through Program. These questions were asked at the conclusion of the interview:

- Question 76: "Thinking over all the things we've been talking about, let's get back to Follow Through. What are the things you like most about Follow Through?
- Question 77: And what are the things you don't like about Follow Through?"

The respondents had by then been exposed to many queries covering several facets of the Follow Through program.

Of the sample of Follow Through parents whose responses to these questions were coded* fewer than a fifth had no comments to make about their "likes" (question 76) whereas over four-fifths stated no "dislikes" (question 77) regarding Follow Through.

All the "likes" of the respondents were coded into broad subject areas, with results as shown in Table 21.

About half of all these Follow Through parents made positive comments about the curriculum, over 40% about teaching methods, over 30% about the special services, 15% about parent activities, and 12% about social benefits to the child.

There are surprisingly few differences according to the level of poverty. Two noteworthy exceptions appear. One is the case of special services--35.7% of the parents commenting on this subject were in the Certain poverty group as opposed to 27.1% in the Not poverty. The other is the opposite tendency for positive comments about teaching to increase as poverty decreases: teaching was more frequently commented on positively by the Not poverty parents (49.0%) than by either the Possible (42.7%) or Certain (35.7%) poverty groups.

---

* These questions were not incorporated in the SRI computer tape at the time the remainder of the survey results were processed. The results presented here are based on a special analysis of a sample of over 930 Follow Through parents, using hand-tally methods. See Annex B-2 for a fuller description of the sampling and processing methods employed.

Table 21

POSITIVE COMMENTS MADE ABOUT FOLLOW THROUGH
(Percent of 933 Follow Through Parents)

Subject of Positive Comment	Certain Poverty	Possible Poverty	Not Poverty	Total
Curriculum	54.3%	59.0%	50.4%	54.0%
Teaching methods	35.7	42.7	49.0	42.3
Special services	35.7	31.7	27.1	31.5
Social benefits to child	13.6	18.9	18.2	15.5
Parent activities	12.3	11.5	13.5	12.5
Other or no comment	17.0	14.5	20.2	17.6
Total*	168.6%	178.3%	178.4%	173.4%

* Totals add to more than 100% because some respondents made several comments in different subject areas.

Variation by Sponsor* with respect to positive comments was substantial--0% to 95.2%--with the widest range in the curriculum area:

Subject of Comment	High	Low
Curriculum	95.2%	24.4%
Teaching	69.1	5.4
Special services	57.4	9.5
Social benefits to child	38.1	2.0
Parent activities	25.5	0
Not specified	51.4	2.4

The flavor of these positive comments about different elements in the program is best captured by what the respondents actually had to say.

* Variations by level of poverty were not computed because of the small number of cases per sponsor.

Many of the parents speaking of the curriculum praised the experimental nature of Follow Through's program and practices. As one parent described it:

> I guess I'm against the traditional approach. I very much like the feeling of experimentation in the classroom, the richness of materials. Anything that is a learning experience is welcomed.

Some of the parents compared the gains made by their Follow Through children with the relatively lesser progress of their older children:

> I like the instruction program very much; of all the phases this is the most outstanding. I have a daughter in the second grade in public school; my Follow Through student in first grade is doing the same work or better. Especially in reading--my Follow Through child can pick up a newspaper and read it; the second grader only guesses.

Still others spoke of the cultural emphasis of Follow Through's bilingual models:

> I like it because they're teaching children to read and write in Cherokee. I think that's good. When I was going to school they punished us if we talked Cherokee.

Individual attention to the child was predominant in many of the comments:

> The teachers take an interest in each child and show no partiality. Each child is taught by his own ability and is not pressured. . . . If a child is especially interested in one thing, the teacher will let him study it--for instance, an animal. (Child) is writing a book about a buffalo.

Quite a few of the parents were appreciative of the field trips taken by Follow Through children:

> I like the trips they go on. They take kids to the market and show them what they're reading about. Like the kids had never heard of blueberries so they found blueberries to show them. And the idea of making the children aware of some of the really historical places that are here to see in (city). (Child) has gone more places than I've ever gone in my life.

As previously mentioned, significantly more of the Certain than Not poverty parents expressed their appreciation for the special services provided by Follow Through. Parents tended to speak in terms of their own inability to provide necessary health care:

> I am greatly pleased with the medical program. They see that they have their shots and checkups that parents like me when I'm working might neglect.

> They help you out. If (child) had not been in Follow Through, we could not have had his teeth fixed.

Several of the parents cast their positive responses in terms of social benefits accruing to their children as a result of their Follow Through participation:

> To me, it is the overall thing that I see in her. I have other children who didn't have the opportunity to go to Follow Through and at (child's) age they were introverted; I am still having problems with them. (Child) is more outgoing. They've made a very cohesive group out of those kids. They all care about each other. They care if someone falls down on the snow.

The attempts made by Follow Through staff to stimulate parent participation were reflected in responses such as the following:

> The teacher made me feel like I was important to the program. She said she would punch me if I went back into my shell. That's how I got involved. When the aide couldn't come she'd ask me and I felt needed.

> They have humans running the program--not "snubby dubbies." And if a mother goes to a meeting she can talk and people will help her. At PTA they would tell you--or look at you--to drop dead.

As noted earlier in this section, relatively few of this sample of Follow Through parents responded with specific comments to question 77, "dislikes." These responses, as coded into subject areas, are summarized in Table 22.

Generally, the statements are divided about equally between curriculum, teaching, and administration and organization. The majority fall into the "other or no comment" category, which includes respondents who

Table 22

NEGATIVE COMMENTS MADE ABOUT FOLLOW THROUGH
(Percent of 933 Follow Through Parents)

Subject of Negative Comment	Certain Poverty	Possible Poverty	Not Poverty	Total
Curriculum	2.5%	6.2%	7.2%	5.1%
Teaching	3.1	3.1	11.0	6.0
Administration and organization	4.5	7.9	10.7	7.6
Other or no comment	91.4	84.6	83.0	86.6
Total*	101.5%	101.8%	111.9%	105.3%

* Totals add to more than 100% because some respondents made several comments in different subject areas.

made such comments as "There's nothing I dislike about it," or "I don't like the criticism of it by people who don't know anything about it." One parent whose response was coded in this category said:

> Oh, there is one fault--if I move out of this area, there is no Follow Through. It is only an experiment in this community. That's the only dislike I have.

There is a consistent tendency for the Certain poverty group to mention fewer dislikes than the Possible and Not poverty parents.

The variation for negative comments by sponsor is less extreme than for the positive comments. As shown below, the range is from 0% expressing dissatisfaction with the curriculum to 21.4% complaining about Follow Through's teaching methods.

Type of Comment	High	Low
Curriculum	14.3%	0.0%
Teaching	21.4	0.0
Administration and organization	20.8	1.8

Most of the negative comments about the curriculum related to method rather than content although a few parents complained of the lack of cultural relevance:

> Black history should be taught. Black pictures should hang around the school.

Interestingly, the main curriculum dislike focused on that aspect of the program most appreciated by the larger group of parents who responded positively in the same area--individualized instruction:

> They are a little too liberal in letting the child have the say as to what they are going to be doing that day. If the teacher is reading a book to the class and if one or more want to do something else they are supposed to be permitted. There are things you have to do in life if you want to or not and you might as well learn while you are young.

Related to these complaints on child freedom were the numerous complaints about the laxity of Follow Through teachers in imposing firm standards of discipline:

> The teachers are not strong enough. There is not enough discipline. If a child feels like standing on his head it's OK. Children should be taught. I feel they have enough time to play at home.

> I think they should be punished and spanked. Out of a room of 22 there's some that's bad.

Only a few parents were negative about teacher attitudes and these remarks seemed to call into question the teacher's understanding of the poverty milieu:

> I sort of suspect that they feel these children are not as intelligent as middle class children and that there is an unprofessional curiosity about the lives of low income people.

> The assumption is that most poor people must be rehabilitated at the age of 5. I feel I can't communicate with the teacher because she is on her lady bountiful trip.

Few parents expressed dissatisfaction with Follow Through's special services, although one Not poverty parent said about her child's school nutrition component:

I don't see the nutritive value of those snacks they given them. They have Hawaiian punch and crackers for a snack. It's making (child) fat and I don't see how it's helping the children who don't get proper food at home.

Some of the complaints about parent participation were similar to those relating to teacher attitudes; namely, the lack of understanding of the parent's real world:

Pressure is put on parents who cannot participate. That's frustrating. It's a ghetto program run by middle-class standards.

I don't like being made to participate once a week--once a month would be OK. But once a week is too much now that I'm working days.

Still others spoke of not being able to afford cab fare or other means of transportation that would enable them to assist in the classroom or attend PAC meetings.

A fair amount of criticism was leveled at program administration and (lack of) organization. Feelings of exclusion were reflected in such responses as "policies and staff are not being determined by the PAC," or the following comment by a Certain poverty parent:

It's always one little nucleus of active people--a small group of parents on committees. It's still not reaching parents because they don't know what's going on. We don't even have a say so on how the money is spent; most parents don't know about it.

The lack of awareness indicated in the above response was also reflected in other comments which perhaps shed light on some of the reasons for parent dissatisfaction with the curriculum. Typical of these were the following:

Well, the only thing I dislike is they don't explain to parents--like the reason for children not being disciplined.

Sometimes we don't know the entire outline--the way the children are being pointed. It's so different from the way we were taught. It's difficult for a parent to understand--you have to get close to it.

Discussion

The results presented in this section show remarkably high levels of satisfaction; these are consistent across all the measures taken. Over 90% of the Follow Through parents in all levels of poverty felt that the programs had been helpful to the child and said they were well satisfied with the child's progress in school; almost as many made comments when asked what they liked about the program. In the one satisfaction variable where comparison is possible--satisfaction with child progress--there is a significant tendency for Follow Through parents to express higher levels of satisfaction than do non-Follow Through parents, but the level for both groups is extremely high. Even the variation by sponsor is more restricted than in most of the variables discussed in other sections of this report.

Parent satisfaction for both Follow Through and non-Follow Through groups, in fact, is so unusually high and the variation by sponsor ranges so little down from the high that questions about the meaning of the satisfaction data must be raised. Were the indicators used not sensitive enough? Or do the results of these measures imply that publicized accounts of general dissatisfaction with the public schools are grossly exaggerated and attributable to a minority of the general public? In this regard, a fairly recent study of public education by Wilson can be cited.* Although the SRI and Wilson findings cannot be compared in a precise manner, two of his measures are roughly equivalent to those used in this survey. One of the questions in the Wilson research asked respondents: "What do you think of the public schools in this part of town--would you say that they are excellent, good, fair, or poor?" The excellent, good, and fair ratings combined totals 76% of Wilson's respondents, an impressive proportion although somewhat lower than the 95% or so of the parents in the present survey who were either "very" or "fairly" satisfied with their child's progress in school, as Table 19 showed. A second measure in the Wilson study obtained an overall judgment of respondent attitudes toward the public schools by combining answers to open-ended questions, roughly similar to the approach used in the "likes" and "dislikes" questions in this survey. Wilson found 82% of his respondents with a neutral to highly favorable attitude, grossly comparable to the overall satisfaction findings of his study.

---

* Alan Wilson, Richmond Youth Project, Technical Report No. 3, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., 1967. His survey involved interviews with adults in Richmond, California.

Dissatisfaction, of course, was reflected both in the answers to the "dislikes" question and the question asking for the type of change desired by those who were not "very" satisfied. Both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents appeared to want more academic work and more discipline in the classroom, with very slight differences between the two groups. Again, these results can be roughly compared with another recent study. A 1969 nationwide public opinion poll* found that about half of the respondents in the lower income brackets felt that discipline in the local public schools was not strict enough. And 66% of all respondents felt that spanking and other forms of physical punishment should be permitted in the lower grades.

Overall, the SRI findings do provide information that Follow Through parents are highly satisfied with the program's attempt to be responsive to the needs of their children. The findings are less informative, however, about the level of parent satisfaction with the subject area of major concern to this report--the parents' own involvement. Of course, the structured questions that were asked were obviously child-centered. But even when parents were invited to speak in an unstructured way about their likes and dislikes of Follow Through they responded primarily in terms of child-related categories, e.g., innovative classroom materials, individual attention by teachers, social development, nutrition and medical care for their children. In contrast, however, one parent pointed out:

> Most people get the wrong impression of Follow Through because they think it is just for the kids, but Follow Through is also for the education of the parents.

Although many of parents made positive comments about the benefits of participation, there were strong hints of dissatisfaction with this aspect of the program. In reading parent "dislikes" it was hard to ignore parents who complained of feelings of exclusion from the classroom and lack of effective parent-teacher communication. Others felt that control of the program rested with a few active parents and that few attempts had been made to inform and involve parents adequately. Lack of understanding of some of Follow Through's innovative attempts in the curriculum area were reflected in the data, some of these closely related to resentment of permissive classroom climates and laxity in discipline.

---

* Gallup, George, "The Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1970, pp. 97-112.

VI SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

As part of the overall evaluation of the national Follow Through program, a nationwide parent interview (PI) survey was conducted in the first quarter of 1970 among parents of Follow Through children and a comparison group of parents of non-Follow Through children.

A total of 14,833 interviews were conducted in 49 communities with 67 Follow Through projects under 20 sponsors. The present report is based on a sample of 5,444 parents--3,601 parents of Follow Through children and 1,843 parents of non-Follow Through children.

Within the overall evaluation, the PI survey serves four main purposes:

(1) To examine the comparability of Follow Through and non-Follow Through children

(2) To determine the effectiveness of Follow Through for different demographic subgroups, primarily in terms of student achievement

(3) To investigate parent attitudes and actions as mediators of the effectiveness of school programs

(4) To measure parent awareness, participation, influence and satisfaction with the Follow Through program.

This report is concerned with purpose (4) listed above. Information relating to the first three purposes is analyzed in the Main Report.

A fundamental aspect of the Follow Through program is that parents be given the opportunity to become involved in the educational process. The Economic Opportunity Act, of which Follow Through is a component, specifically urges that parent activities become part of the program; the Follow Through guidelines issued by the Office of Education specify in detail the opportunities that should be available for parent participation.

The analysis plan for this report includes:

1. Comparisons of Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents to provide estimates of the extent to which Follow Through is achieving selected parent involvement goals.

2. Data organized in nearly all cases by three levels of poverty--Certain poverty, Possible poverty, and Not poverty--so as to assess the effects of Follow Through on its target population and upon a population somewhat less poor.

3. Ranges of variation by Follow Through sponsor to provide an indication of the extent to which programs can vary in parent involvement.

4. Data aggregated over all grade levels involved--kindergarten, entering and non-entering first, and second.

In summary, this report seeks to evaluate levels of parent involvement by comparisons of Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents, holding constant the levels of poverty and aggregating over all grade levels and sponsors; the range of variation among the individual sponsors is included, but no attempt has been made to analyze by sponsor group.

Awareness

The findings indicate that, in general, the level of awareness of Follow Through parents is in the middle ranges. Without prompting, 52% were able to report that the child was in Follow Through and 20% that they know of the PAC. When prompted, an additional 12% reported their child was in Follow Through and 21% that they had heard of the PAC. Generally, awareness is highest for the Not poverty Follow Through parents.

On the only awareness question where Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents can be compared--awareness of groups and organizations that work with the schools--the Follow Through parents showed significantly higher awareness, with the largest difference in the Not poverty group.

Awareness variation by sponsor is striking: from 26% to 95% for child being in Follow Through; from 32% to 75% for groups and organizations, and from 0% to 52% for the PAC.

Participation

It is clear that Follow Through exceeds non-Follow Through on all four measures of parent participation where comparison was possible--visits to the classroom, work in the classroom, private talks with the teacher, and private talks with other school personnel--and does so overall and at all three levels of poverty.

While there is a predominance of significant differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through, either for the total groups or for the three categories of poverty, the differences are typically small. It is, of course, the consistency of the tendency for Follow Through to exceed non-Follow Through parents on all of these measures of parent participation that suggests a pervasive, if modest, Follow Through effect.

There is a strong tendency for measures of participation to increase as poverty diminshes. This is true for classroom visits, work in the classroom, and talks with the teacher. Only in the case of talks with non-teaching personnel is this relation not present. Thus, typically, the participation levels are smallest for the main target group--the Certain poverty parents. Even so, the data are consistent in showing that even in that category, participation is greater among Follow Through than non-Follow Through parents.

The range of variation by sponsor is, in most cases, very dramatic. In all but the case of working in the classroom, the gap between the high and low exceeds 60 percentage points.

Parent membership in the PAC typically involves a small proportion of the total Follow Through parents. It is an open question whether there would be more actual participation with the PAC if awareness were increased. In any event, the one variable for which a sponsor range is available at this time--PAC members who had attended a PAC meeting--indicates that there is a wide range of such involvement possible; in this instance, from 20% to 60%.

Influence

The set of questions concerning parent influence did not strongly discriminate between Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents. The slight differences observed, while showing somewhat higher positive scores for Follow Through than non-Follow Through parents, were notable mainly for the preponderance (around 70%) of positive scores (i.e., "strongly" and "slightly" agree) on the part of both groups. There is little variation by poverty level.

The perceptions of the parents who were aware of the PAC are remarkable in that there appears to be a very high confidence that the PAC can accomplish useful ends. Overall, about 90% of parents aware of the PAC think it can be an effective means of dealing with school problems. Additionally, from 60% to 90% feel the PAC could be influential on such school issues as hiring of teachers, spending school money, and curricula, and in working with the school board. There is little variation by poverty level.

Satisfaction

Remarkably high levels of satisfaction were found across all the measures taken. Over 90% of the Follow Through parents at all levels of poverty felt that the program had been helpful to their child and said they were well satisfied with the child's progress in school; almost as many made comments when asked what they liked about the program. In the one satisfaction variable where comparison is possible--satsifaction with child's progress--there is a significant tendency for Follow Through parents to express higher levels of satisfaction than do non-Follow Through parents, but the level for both groups is extremely high. Satisfaction is considerably higher for the Certain than the Not poverty Follow Through parents.

Conclusions

It should be emphasized that this parent survey was conducted at a time when most sponsors and schools were still trying to perfect their Follow Through projects. Moreover, the data were derived from a multi-purpose survey which necessarily limited the intensity and depth with which any one aspect of parent behavior could be explored. The findings must therefore be treated as provisional. Succeeding studies can determine if the patterns of parent involvement described in this report change as the projects develop over time. The comments to follow were developed primarily with this succeeding work in mind.

Overall, the findings on the four measures of parent involvement (awareness, participation, influence, and satisfaction) show, with few exceptions that the Follow Through parents achieve higher levels than non-Follow Through parents. While the differences between groups are statistically significant in many cases, most of the differences are relatively small. However, the notable consistency with which Follow Through parents exceed non-Follow Through parents suggests that Follow Through is achieving progress toward some of the goals specified in the Guidelines.

Most variables have shown a rather wide variation by sponsor. The variation in some instances was dramatic. These departures from the mean levels of involvement are unusually interesting. They invite a whole series of questions. Are the differences due to factors associated with the Follow Through program, or do environmental factors at the community level account for this variation? Are instances of extremely high participation levels related to student success in school? These types of questions cannot be answered with currently available data. More information is needed about project activities at the level of the school and the community in order that measures of parent involvement can be related to other project variables.

There is a fairly consistent tendency for the levels of parent involvement to be negatively related to levels of poverty. That is, the most poor parents tend to have lower levels than do slightly more affluent parents. (It has been noted, however, that even in the Certain poverty category, the Follow Through group achieve generally higher levels of involvement than non-Follow Through parents.) Since Follow Through's primary target is the most poor, it would be useful to explore any means by which sponsors attempt to reach this group. The wide range of sponsor variation suggests there may be projects with interesting approaches to involving the poorest of parents. More intensive analysis of such programs could yield information useful in developing new program approaches to this problem.

The information developed on awareness in this parent survey shows a rather modest level of awareness on several counts, including awareness of the child being in Follow Through and awareness of the PAC. At the same time, there are wide variations by sponsors in leve s of awareness. Since awareness would precede in most cases any meaningful participation by the parent, it seems useful to explore the means by which high levels of awareness can be achieved in short periods of time, as has evidently been the case in some sponsors programs. It would be useful to know more about those sites where awareness is particularly high (and perhaps particularly low) on various aspects of Follow Through and to determine those program attributes responsible.

ANNEXES

Annex B-1

EXTRACTS FROM THE FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM GUIDELINES

The following extracts from the Guidelines dated February 24, 1969 are those directly related to parent participation in Follow Through projects.

from PREFACE

. . . each potential Follow Through community must give clear evidence that it will implement and support processes leading to:

- The direct participation of the parents of Follow Through children in the development, conduct, and overall direction of the project;

from SECTION III. PARENT PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Follow Through is one of the special emphasis programs within the community action title of the Economic Opportunity Act. One of the aims of community action is to give low-income people a larger voice in handling their own affairs, in determining the priority of their needs, and in establishing the ways in which those needs shall be met. Follow Through guidelines--especially those sections requiring the involvement of parents, representatives of relevant community agencies, and other individuals having concern for the poor in project planning and operation--reflect this aim of community action. The Follow Through Program is committed to efforts that assist in opening up the school and the community to each other for the benefit of the child, the home, and the school.

A. Parent Participation

EVERY FOLLOW THROUGH PROJECT MUST PROVIDE FOR SIGNIFICANT PARENT PARTICIPATION IN ALL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT.

A basic tenet of Follow Through is that parents have both the right and the responsibility to share in determining the nature of their children's education. Accordingly, parents must be given opportunities to take an active role in all aspects of Follow Through. Interaction between parents and Follow Through staff--in homes, classrooms, and elsewhere in the community--can (1) help parents learn how they can best support and influence the program and, on their own, contribute more fully to their child's total development and (2) help staff become more responsive to the needs and goals of the parents and community and translate such goals into meaningful project activities.

At least four major kinds of parent participation are necessary for an effective Follow Through project:

- Participation in the process of making decisions about the nature and operation of the project through frequent meetings of a Policy Advisory Committee and other parent groups;
- Participation in the classroom and school as paid employees, volunteers, or observers;
- Provision for regular home contact by Follow Through staff;
- Parent educational and community activities which parents have helped develop.

A staff member, preferably low-income, should be designated to coordinate parent participation activities. This section (Section III, A) deals only with the first of these parent participation activities. The other three activities are discussed in Section V, D, below.

1. The Policy Advisory Committee. Every Follow Through project must have a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) of which at least fifty percent of the members must be elected from among low-income parents of children in Follow Through classes. The remaining members should be drawn from agencies, community groups, and individuals that have a concern for poor children.

The PAC must include a representative designated by the CAA. The PAC may include representatives from the pre-school project, local health, welfare, and social service agencies. The Follow Through coordinator and other professional or nonprofessional project staff responsible for instruction, health, nutrition, social and psychological services may serve as non-voting members or as consultants to this committee. The selection of non-parent representatives should be discussed with the parent members prior to their appointment. The parent coordinator should work closely with the PAC and provide necessary staff support.

A chairman should be elected from among the Follow Through parents on the committee and should schedule frequent meetings of the PAC. The PAC must have the right to set its own agenda.

The PAC should be encouraged to form sub-committees in areas such as personnel, career development, curriculum, evaluation, fund-raising, budget, grievances, parent activities, community relations, etc. Persons not members of the PAC may be designated members of such sub-committees. Provision should be made for funds to be made available to the PAC to support its activities.

In communities where potential Follow Through participants and parents have not yet been identified, the applicant should organize an interim advisory group that includes parents elected by the Policy Advisory Committee of the local Head Start or equivalent pre-school program. If there is no pre-school Policy Advisory committee, the LEA and CAA should work cooperatively to establish the interim Follow Through advisory group of which half the members shall be elected from among the parents of the low-income children enrolled in the pre-school program. When and where there is no CAA the LEA and the parents of the low-income children in the pre-school program should co-sponsor such an election. When the Follow Through project children are identified, the parents of these children shall then elect representatives to the PAC to replace the parent members of the interim committee.

The Policy Advisory Committee must play a substantial role in the planning and management of the Follow Through project.

At a minimum, the PAC will:

- Represent the interests and concerns of the parents, professional organizations, and public agencies.
- Actively participate in the development of and give approval to the Follow Through application before it is submitted.
- Establish criteria for the selection of Follow Through staff personnel (paid and volunteer) and participate in their recruitment and selection.
- Continually assess the effectiveness of the Follow Through project and make recommendations to the project coordinator regarding program improvements.
- Establish a procedure by which grievances and complaints of parents and others can receive prompt and sympathetic consideration, and participate in working toward their resolution.
- Assist in organizing parent activities.
- Communicate with parents, community agencies and organizations, and others to encourage their active participation in the Follow Through project.
- Assist in mobilizing community resources.

2. Other Parent Groups. Monthly meetings of the parents in each Follow Through school or of all Follow Through parents, depending on the size of the project, should become an established practice. These meetings will serve to keep parents in constant touch with new developments in the project and provide opportunities for them to discuss issues and make suggestions and recommendations which may then be referred to the Policy Advisory Committee and the project coordinator for action. Parent groups and Follow Through staff may engage in such activities as joint meetings, informal discussions, and workshops focusing on matters of mutual concern.

from SECTION IV. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

A. Selection of Program Approach

. . . The Policy Advisory Committee (or Interim Advisory Committee) described in Section III, A, above must be established as the first step, so that it can participate in the selection of the program approach. The applicant should take steps to present and explain to as many parents as possible the range of available program approaches as well as the general goals of Follow Through. All persons who will participate in the local Follow Through project--parents, other community representatives, project staff--should consider this information and take part in the discussions leading to the selection of an approach.

from SECTION V. THE LOCAL PROGRAM

D. Parent Activities

EVERY FOLLOW THROUGH PROJECT MUST DEVELOP ACTIVITIES HAVING SIGNIFICANCE TO PARENTS OF FOLLOW THROUGH CHILDREN.

As set forth in Section III, A, above, each Follow Through project must provide for the following parent participation activities:

1. Parent Participation in the Project as Paid Employees, Volunteers of Observers. Each Follow Through Project must make provisions for ample parent participation in classroom and other project activities, in both paraprofessional and unpaid capacities. Having parents in the classroom:

- gives the staff an opportunity to know the parents better and to learn from them;
- enables school staff to explain and interpret the school program to parents and others in the community;
- gives parents a better understanding of project objectives and activities and the kinds of home assistance their children may require;
- shows the child the depth of his parent's interest in him and his school program.

For these reasons, low-income persons in the project area, especially parents of Follow Through children, must be given preference in the employment of nonprofessionals in a Follow Through project. Many parents may be able to serve as volunteers as well.

Follow Through classrooms must be open to parent observers at reasonable and convenient times. Parents should be encouraged to observe classes several times during the year. Some parts of the project might be arranged in the evening or on Saturday to permit fathers to observe.

There are, of course, many activities outside the classroom (e.g., field trips, health visits, social occasions) in which the presence of parents is equally desirable and profitable.

2. Provisions for Regular Home Contact by Follow Through Staff. Staff, parents, and children will all benefit from home visits and telephone calls. Every effort must be made to explain the advantages of such interaction between school and home.

Home visits by Follow Through personnel should be made only with the prior knowledge and full consent of the parents. Contingent upon parent consent, project staff including classroom personnel, health, and social workers, should visit each home as frequently as is appropriate and desired.

Home visits should have a purpose--e.g., exchange of information on a child's behavior and interests; explanation of how parents can reinforce learning in areas such as verbal and fine motor skills or how parents can structure play for maximum learning.

Where home visits are inconvenient or not desired, telephone calls by program staff are an excellent way to inform parents of their children's progress and to demonstrate the desire of Follow Through staff to maintain contact with the home.

3. Educational and Community Activities for Parents. The Follow Through project must develop plans for educational and community activities, which are responsive to the needs expressed by parents. The parents, through the PAC and other parent groups, should participate fully in the development of such plans. In many cases, appropriate courses may already be available to serve the needs which parents may

express, e.g., sewing, carpentry, etc., by the Y.M.C.A. or similar organizations, literacy training by the schools, or classes in consumer buying and credit conducted by a community organization. Parents should be assisted in making full use of such existing resources. When existing resources do not meet the needs of parents, it will be necessary to establish new activities that are centered around the expressed needs of Follow Through parents.

In order to facilitate participation in parent activities, Follow Through mothers and project staff can work to establish cooperative child-care arrangements. Space within project facilities should be made available for child care service as well as for parent meetings.

Parents acting cooperatively and with the help of others in the neighborhood should be encouraged to organize for their children and themselves after-school activities which utilize the home and neighborhood as learning environments.

Annex B-2

PROCEDURES USED IN THE PARENT INTERVIEW SURVEY

This annex describes the Parent Interview (PI) survey: (1) the selection of respondents; (2) the development of the survey forms; (3) the field work; (4) the data processing; and (5) the response rate and community relations.

Selection of Respondents

To meet the purposes of the survey, it was important to include among the respondents: (1) parents of children in schools and classrooms that were part of other data collection samples so that analyses could be made of a variety of measures, such as achievement test scores, in relation to family variables; (2) a sufficiently large number of respondents so that Follow Through and non-Follow Through groups with similar characteristics could be derived; (3) a sufficiently large number of respondents so that attrition losses would not preclude reinterviews with subsamples of parents at later times.

The initial plan called for interviews with both Follow Through and non-Follow Through parents in 50 communities in which there were Follow Through projects under 20 sponsors. However, Tacoma, Washington was dropped at the request of the local PAC chairman, thereby reducing the sample to 49 communities and 67 projects. Interviews were to be obtained from parents of children in entering grades and in the "continuing" sample--that is, children who had been included for achievement testing and other purposes in the Fall of 1968--and from parents of children in grade four who had never been exposed to Follow Through. A maximum of 355 interviews per project was set, according to the following numbers of children:

Entering (K or 1st)			Continuing			Fourth Grade
FT	Non-FT	Total	FT	Non-FT	Total	Total
120	80	200	45	30	75	80

An initial estimate (December 19, 1969) of the maximum number of parent interviews that could be conducted using the totals shown above was 18,720. This was almost immediately reduced to 17,480 and then to 16,094 as data coming in from the Fall achievement testing effort indicated that fewer children were available in some categories than originally estimated. The names were provided to the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), the subcontractor that did the interviewing. Of the 16,094 target families, NORC was able to locate 15,284 (95%) and of those located, to complete a parent interview with 14,833 (97%), as Table B-2-1 shows.

The large majority of the respondents (over 93%)* were the actual mothers, and all were adults responsible for the children in the family. For convenience, all are referred to as "parents."

Six ranges of annual income were used in the parent interview. The number of categories was limited since there were fears that any more detailed questioning about income would meet with negative reactions from the respondents (in practice, such fears proved to be largely unjustified). These six ranges overlap the OEO "poverty line" index for Fiscal Year 1969, as appended to the Follow Through Guidelines, and therefore operational definitions were developed for classifying the respondents into three poverty groups, as shown below in terms of the number of people in the family (household):

Total Annual Income (dollars)	Certain Poverty		Possible Poverty		Not Poverty	
	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm
≤$1,000	≥1	≥1	--	--	--	--
1,000-2,999	≥4	≥3	2-3	2	1	1
3,000-4,999	≥8	≥7	4-7	3-6	≤3	≤2
5,000-7,499	≥13	≥11	8-12	7-10	≤7	≤6
7,500-9,999	≥17	≥15	13-16	11-14	≤12	≤10
10,000+	≥21	≥19	17-20	15-18	≤16	≤14

The "Certain Poverty" group includes all respondents whose family incomes fall below the OEO's 1969 poverty line and the "Not Poverty" group includes all those with incomes above the poverty line. "Possible Poverty"

---

* Estimated from the sample of 933 interviews which were selected for analysis of questions 76 and 77, as described later.

Table B-2-1

LOCATION AND TOTAL NUMBER OF PARENT INTERVIEWS
(Spring 1970)

City, State	Located (number)	Completed	
		Number	Percent
Tuskegee, Alabama	348	342	98.3%
Jonesboro, Arkansas	289	283	97.9
Pulaski County, Arkansas	252	250	99.2
Berkeley, California	341	324	95.0
Los Angeles, California	256	230	89.8
San Diego, California	281	275	97.9
San Jose, California	250	242	96.8
Tulare, California	260	252	96.9
Laurel, Delaware	293	284	96.9
Wilmington, Delaware	276	268	97.1
Washington, D.C.	109	109	100.0
Miami, Florida	209	208	99.5
Jacksonville, Florida	255	255	100.0
Okaloosa, Florida	298	294	98.6
Tampa, Florida	275	273	99.3
Atlanta, Georgia	321	315	98.1
Jasper, Georgia	239	237	99.2
La Fayette, Georgia	270	263	97.4
East St. Louis, Illinois	296	282	95.3
Chicago, Illinois	291	281	96.6
St Martin Parish, Louisiana	197	193	98.0
Baltimore, Maryland	230	223	97.0
Boston, Massachusetts	106	99	93.4
Detroit, Michigan	309	298	96.4
Flint, Michigan	278	275	98.9
Grand Rapids, Michigan	221	219	99.1
Duluth, Minnesota	313	305	97.4
Montevideo, Minnesota	264	263	99.6
Greenwood, Mississippi	284	280	98.6
Tupelo, Mississippi	208	207	99.5
Kansas City, Missouri	453	440	97.1
Portageville, Missouri	210	206	98.1
Lebanon, New Hampshire	163	163	100.0
Lakewood, New Jersey	258	250	96.9
Rochester, New York	166	164	98.8
New York City, New York	1,356	1,237	91.2
Cherokee, North Carolina	179	176	98.3
Smithfield, North Carolina	262	250	95.4
Akron, Ohio	273	261	95.6
Portland, Oregon	248	243	98.0
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1,764	1,711	96.9
Greenwood, South Carolina	248	247	99.6
Chattanooga, Tennessee	268	266	99.3
Nashville, Tennessee	270	267	98.9
Ft. Worth, Texas	334	328	98.2
Brattleboro, Vermont	171	164	95.9
Elkins, West Virginia	325	323	99.4
Welch, West Virginia	240	239	99.6
Racine, Wisconsin	277	269	97.1
Total	15,284	14,833	97.0%

signifies, as its name implies, the respondents whose household incomes possibly meet the OEO definition--the respondents remaining, who could not be classified unambiguously under "Certain" or "Not."

Table B-2-2 shows the distribution of the total sample among these poverty groups, by each of the 20 sponsors (identified with a code letter).

The choice of projects was purposeful, not random or probabilistic. Some 45 projects had been selected for the 1968-69 study sample and were included in the PI survey--with the exception of a few localities where, for geographical reasons, the cost of interviewing would have been exhorbitant, and others where parent interviewing was deemed inappropriate because of the attitudes of local educational authorities or other essentially "political" reasons. Other projects were later added to the study sample, and thus to the PI survey, to include new sponsors or new projects that had developed in the meantime.

Within each project area, the schools selected for the comparison (non-Follow Through) study sample were those with classes as similar as possible to the Follow Through classes in the economic and racial composition of the families, and those in as close physical proximity as possible to the Follow Through schools--within the limitations imposed by racial and economic similarity. A further requirement was that, if possible, the Follow Through and comparison schools should tend to agree in the proportions of children with previous Head Start experience.

Although a total of 14,833 home interviews were completed, 775 could not be correlated with individual pupil measures. Achievement test data were not obtained at all for these cases or, if obtained, could not be matched with parent interview data in time to be used in the present analyses.

All of these cases were children who had been tested in 1968-69. Overall, about one-third of the Follow Through children and one-half of the non-Follow Through children tested in 1968-69 were not included in the Spring 1970 testing sample.

About 150 of the 775 were children who had moved from the neighborhood or to another school, and hence were no longer in the test school sample, but whose parents had been traced and interviewed. An additional 65 were identified after the closing date for merging interview and test data tapes for analytical runs; most of these initial "losses" are accounted for by changes in name reporting or actual name changes. For 83 cases, no information has been verified that will account for the mismatch between the parent interview total and the test sample total.

Table B-2-2

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARENT INTERVIEW SAMPLE, BY SPONSOR GROUP AND POVERTY CLASSIFICATION

	Follow Through					Non-Follow Through					Total				
Sponsor	Number	Certain Poverty (percent)	Possible Poverty (percent)	Not Poverty (percent)	Unknown (percent)	Number	Certain Poverty (percent)	Possible Poverty (percent)	Not Poverty (percent)	Unknown (percent)	Number	Certain Poverty (percent)	Possible Poverty (percent)	Not Poverty (percent)	Unknown (percent)
Group 1															
R	246	38.2%	22.4%	37.0%	2.4%	238	31.9%	16.4%	50.4%	1.3%	484	35.1%	19.4%	43.6%	1.9%
J	711	40.9	25.2	33.1	0.8	629	32.3	20.2	46.3	1.3	1,340	36.9	22.8	39.3	1.0
G	466	45.9	24.0	24.5	5.6	485	40.0	23.9	30.1	6.0	951	42.9	24.0	27.3	5.8
H	269	22.3	16.7	58.7	2.2	316	25.9	18.7	53.5	1.9	585	24.3	17.8	55.9	2.1
B	364	46.7	26.1	22.0	5.2	349	39.0	22.9	33.0	5.2	713	42.9	24.5	27.3	5.2
M	89	48.3	29.2	21.3	1.1	84	36.9	34.5	23.8	4.8	173	42.8	31.8	22.5	2.9
Group 2															
N	386	20.7	16.1	61.6	1.6	405	12.6	15.3	69.9	2.2	791	16.6	15.7	65.9	1.9
C	706	39.1	24.2	33.3	3.4	684	42.7	20.8	32.7	3.8	1,390	40.9	22.5	33.0	3.6
L	483	31.7	17.8	44.7	5.8	485	20.0	17.9	55.1	7.0	968	25.8	17.9	49.9	6.4
Group 3															
P	452	42.9	26.5	28.1	2.4	618	32.8	21.0	43.0	3.1	1,070	37.1	23.4	36.7	2.8
E	441	50.8	22.4	24.0	2.7	544	43.8	13.4	39.3	3.5	985	46.9	17.5	32.5	3.1
I	586	43.3	25.4	29.7	1.5	685	43.9	20.3	34.2	1.6	1,271	43.7	22.7	32.1	1.6
Q	269	37.9	24.9	27.1	10.0	265	44.5	24.5	27.2	3.8	534	41.2	24.7	27.2	6.9
A	116	40.5	13.8	39.7	6.0	123	52.0	15.4	31.7	0.8	239	46.4	14.6	35.6	3.3
D	94	46.8	39.4	10.6	3.2	164	42.1	23.2	34.8	0.0	258	43.8	29.1	26.0	1.2
K	113	43.4	28.3	27.4	0.9	63	57.1	19.0	22.2	1.6	176	48.3	25.0	25.6	1.1
T	179	55.3	19.0	16.2	9.5	208	53.4	27.4	16.3	2.9	387	54.3	23.5	16.3	5.9
O	213	31.5	24.9	40.8	2.8	259	29.3	20.8	44.8	5.0	472	30.3	22.7	43.0	4.0
Group 4															
F	755	35.9	28.1	32.8	3.2	761	35.3	26.8	35.1	2.8	1,516	35.6	27.4	34.0	3.0
Group 5															
S	340	36.8	18.5	36.5	8.2	190	50.0	20.5	23.7	5.8	530	41.5	19.2	31.9	7.4
Total	7,278	39.2	23.5	33.5	3.7	7,555	36.3	20.8	39.6	3.3	14,833	37.8	22.1	36.7	3.5

The most common reasons for omitting children from the Spring 1970 test sample were somewhat different for Follow Through and non-Follow Through children. For non-Follow Through children, the most common cause was a change in comparison schools--sometimes at the behest of the local district and sometimes to improve the comparability of the Follow Through and non-Follow Through samples. Among Follow Through pupils, the most common reason for exclusion from the Spring 1970 test sample was the operational decision to test whole classrooms in preference to tracking individual children.

In terms of importance to the overall longitudinal evaluation, losses of matched cases from these continuing grades are less critical than mismatches will be in future years. Most children in the non-entering grades in 1969-70 were ones who had entered Follow Through during its first year or two of local implementation and therefore were "premature" as reflections of growth and development brought about by Follow-Through. To simplify the analyses, all 775 cases have been excluded for the present.

Table B-2-3 shows the sample of 14,058 (14,833 less 775) by grade level of the child and by type of interview form used (the "long" or "short" form described later). For present reporting purposes, the 3,685 parents of grade four pupils are excluded, leaving a final, effective sample of 10,373. Table B-2-4 summarizes the basic demographic characteristics of these households, and Table B-2-5 shows the same data for the 5,444 respondents who received the "long" interview.

Development of Survey Forms

Planning and Revision of Survey Forms

The first version of a parent interview form, largely open-ended, evolved during October and November 1968 and was tried out during early stages of preparation for the community case studies. Early in December 1968, this open-ended version was transformed into the first draft of a structured questionnaire. In mid-December 1968, following internal review at SRI and a day of consulting with one of the Follow Through sponsors, a revised version was forwarded to OE/Follow Through for comment. In a planning meeting (Menlo Park, California, December 18-20, 1968) this draft was reviewed and was judged to be not ready for submission for clearance for pretest, although differences of opinion emerged between SRI project staff and OE/Follow Through personnel regarding the appropriateness of deferring empirical trials.

Table B-2-3

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, BY CHILD'S GRADE LEVEL AND INTERVIEW FORM COMPLETED

	Follow Through			Non-Follow Through			Total		
Grade	Long Form	Short Form	Total	Long Form	Short Form	Total	Long Form	Short Form	Total
indergarten	2,084	1,956	4,040	1,072	1,048	2,120	3,156	3,004	6,160
ntering 1	941	751	1,692	615	507	1,122	1,556	1,258	2,814
onentering 1	427	388	815	106	100	206	533	488	1,021
	149	130	279	50	49	99	199	179	378
	--	--	--	--	3,685	3,685	--	3,685	3,685*
Total	3,601	3,225	6,826	1,843	5,389	7,232	5,444	8,614	14,058*

* For present analytical purposes, the 3,685 parents of grade four pupils have been excluded, leaving a final, effective sample of 10,373.

Table B-2-4

BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS--10,373 HOUSEHOLDS*
(Percent)

	Follow Through			Non-Follow Through		
	Cert. Pov.	Poss. Pov.	Not Pov.	Cert. Pov.	Poss. Pov.	Not Pov.
Employment of household head						
Currently employed	26.0%	21.5%	40.9	24.8%	18.6%	47.0%
Looking for work	3.4	1.5	0.7	2.3	0.8	1.5
Not in labor force	3.6	1.5	0.8	3.1	1.5	0.8
Total	5,112 (100%)			2,911 (100%)		
Education of household head						
High school or more	9.1	8.3	19.0	6.4	13.3	22.5
Some high school	15.5	9.0	9.4	11.7	7.4	11.6
8 years or less	16.2	7.4	6.2	14.6	6.1	6.4
Total	6,510 (100%)			3,628 (100%)		
Sex of household head						
Male	18.7	14.7	30.4	16.5	14.3	38.7
Female	22.2	9.9	4.1	18.7	7.5	4.3
Total	6,577 (100%)			3,439 (100%)		
Ethnic origin of respondent						
Black	30.4	15.6	16.1	27.2	14.4	19.4
White	6.4	5.6	15.2	5.8	5.4	20.8
Other	4.0	3.5	3.2	2.2	2.0	2.7
Total	6,554 (100%)			3,431 (100%)		
Home ownership						
Owns	9.1	7.1	16.9	4.7	7.3	24.6
Rents	30.9	17.8	18.2	25.8	14.8	18.8
Total	6,404 (100%)			3,335 (100%)		
Annual income of household						
Under $3,000	28.2	0.6	0.0	24.8	0.6	0.0
$3,000-$4,999	11.1	16.2	3.5	9.3	13.7	0.6
$5,000 or more	1.3	8.0	34.2	1.1	7.4	42.3
Total	6,537 (100%)			3,439 (100%)		
Number in household						
3 or fewer	3.1	2.7	3.0	3.1	2.7	1.2
4-5	10.2	8.7	17.6	8.5	8.3	23.4
6 or more	27.6	13.3	13.8	23.7	11.0	15.4
Total	6,577 (100%)			3,438 (100%)		

* These data are based on the 10,373 parents of kindergarten through grade two pupils but the "N" for any one characteristic is less owing to "don't knows" and other losses of data.

Table B-2-5

BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS--5,444 HOUSEHOLDS*
(Percent)

	Follow Through			Non-Follow Through		
	Cert. Pov.	Poss. Pov.	Not Pov.	Cert. Pov.	Poss. Pov.	Not Pov.
Employment of household head						
Currently employed	26.8%	22.1%	40.2%	22.7%	17.9%	50.3%
Looking for work	3.2	1.5	0.4	2.3	0.7	0.7
Not in labor force	3.8	1.3	0.7	2.8	1.7	0.9
Total	2,719 (100%)			1,470 (100%)		
Education of household head						
High school or more	8.6	8.6	18.9	6.8	6.4	24.0
Some high school	15.9	8.9	9.0	12.0	7.4	13.4
8 years or less	16.8	7.3	6.0	16.4	6.4	7.2
Total	3,428 (100%)			1,770 (100%)		
Sex of household head						
Male	19.6	14.7	30.0	16.6	13.6	40.0
Female	21.9	10.1	3.8	18.8	6.8	4.2
Total	3,460 (100%)			1,793 (100%)		
Ethnic origin of respondent						
Black	31.5	15.6	15.9	26.5	13.8	20.2
White	6.6	5.7	14.7	6.6	5.0	21.4
Other	4.0	3.4	2.8	2.3	1.6	2.6
Total	3,483 (100%)			1,787 (100%)		
Home ownership						
Own	9.5	7.1	16.6	8.5	6.3	25.5
Rent	31.0	17.9	17.9	26.0	14.5	19.1
Total	3,358 (100%)			1,743 (100%)		
Annual income of household						
Under $3,000	28.5	0.6	0.0	25.4	0.7	0.0
$3,000-$4,999	11.6	16.0	0.3	9.2	13.0	0.6
$5,000 or more	1.4	8.1	33.5	0.8	6.7	43.7
Total	3,460 (100%)			1,793 (100%)		
Number in household						
3 or fewer	2.7	2.7	2.6	3.1	2.2	3.7
4-5	9.5	8.8	17.1	8.3	7.4	24.5
6 or more	29.3	13.2	14.1	23.9	10.8	16.0
Total	3,460 (100%)			1,793 (100%)		

* These data are based on the 5,444 parents (of kindergarten through grade two pupils) who received the long interview but the "N" for any one characteristic is less owing to "don't knows" and other losses of data.

A period of additional review within the Institute led to a second revision prepared for review and discussion at another planning conference (Pajaro Dunes, California, April 1969). Prior to this conference, preliminary negotiations had been undertaken with NORC and it was tentatively agreed that NORC would be the major subcontractor in field interviewing. Paul Sheatsley of NORC attended a portion of the Pajaro Dunes conference to discuss the parent survey. The conference resulted in an advisory committee being established under the chairmanship of Douglass Price-Williams to advise in field testing and subsequent revision. Although no formal decisions were made, the advisory committee did agree that a pretest should be undertaken as soon as possible.

Suggestions made during the Pajaro Dunes conference or obtained from sponsors shortly afterward were incorporated in a third revision that was submitted to OE/Follow Through for review and comment late in May 1969. Copies were also sent for review to the advisory committee and other selected reviewers.

In early July, NORC conducted pretests in Racine, Wisconsin, which resulted in a fourth version of the parent interview form that was presented for further discussion and review at another planning conference (Palo Alto, California, July 30-August 2, 1969). Consequent to that meeting, and with extensive help from Robert Hess, a fifth version was completed in late August.

Additional discussions regarding the interview were held (Washington, D.C., September 1969) between Robert Hess, Ronald Henderson, and OE/Follow Through staff but not including any SRI project representative. Several suggestions for revision were again forthcoming from these conversations, as well as from comments obtained from several sponsors who replied to requests for comments.

Some further changes were made in the draft as a result of the September review and the resulting version was discussed at another planning meeting (Evanston, Illinois, late September 1969). The importance of obtaining clearance was underscored at that meeting by representatives of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Bureau of the Budget who were in attendance. They pointed out that the 1970 Census would result in a moratorium on federally sponsored surveys during the period from March 1 through June 30, 1970.

In the week following the Evanston meeting, SRI undertook another cycle of review and editing. On October 3, 1969, a draft was submitted to OE/Follow Through for submission to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance and authority to undertake extensive pretesting.

Another planning meeting (Washington, November 20-21, 1969) was devoted in large part to two topics:

1. Expediting clearance of the proposed schedule so that field work could be completed before the moratorium

2. Exploring the feasibility of a greatly enlarged parent sample so that demographic and other information regarding home circumstances could be used to improve the match between larger numbers of Follow Through and non-Follow Through pupils and families.

At this meeting it was agreed that the extensive pretest planned at the time of submitting the instrument for clearance would have to be cancelled if the final field work were to be completed prior to the interviewing moratorium.

The interview schedule received final revision as a result of another planning meeting (Washington, D.C., December 11-12, 1969) and was presented at a meeting on December 15 at which OE/Follow Through, Office of Economic Opportunity, Bureau of the Budget, and SRI were all represented. A few "speculative" open-ended questions that were considered experimental for the pretest were deleted and a few additional questions were structured rather than left open. This final draft was submitted "for the record" on December 16, 1970, the immediately prior draft having actually been submitted for clearance at the meeting the day before. The "short form" also received final agreement at the December 15 meeting.

Clearance from the Bureau of the Budget was obtained January 8, 1970. Interviewing started about January 17, 1970 and was almost completed by the planned deadline of February 28. OE/Follow Through was able to obtain an extension to March 15 so that NORC might obtain a higher completion rate.

A copy of the long form and the short form appear at the end of this annex. Approximately one-third of the total interviews were carried out with the long interview schedule, which required approximately one hour to administer, and the remaining two-thirds were limited to the short form, requiring about 20 minutes. All the parents of grade four students were administered the short form. Thus, more than half of the parents of pupils in the other grades were given the long interview.

Content of Survey Forms

The short form includes key demographic questions and a limited number of items concerned with attitudes toward school and general "life style," to provide a large base for this type of information needed to compare the effectiveness of Follow Through for different demographic subgroups and for associating "life styles" measures with other descriptive and evaluative information, primarily achievement scores.

These subject areas were included in the long form, and many others were candidates for inclusion. During the development effort narrated above, fairly consistent agreement was reached on the importance of the following subject areas within which the questions were formulated:

1. Demographic characteristics
2. General "life style" and attitudes
3. Interest in and knowledge about Follow Through
4. Participation in policy making with respect to educational programs
5. Parent contact with the school and its staff
6. Feelings of efficacy in relation to the school
7. Feelings of being able to control one's life
8. Support and guidance of child with respect to educational programs
9. Extent of educationally relevant stimulation in the home environment
10. Aspirations for the child's future.

Field Work

The field work was directed from NORC's New York office and conducted by NORC with close communication among NORC, OE/Follow Through, and SRI.

NORC appointed a local supervisor for each geographic location. In areas where a qualified resident supervisor could not be located,

a resident coordinator was appointed and the supervisor from another community would then travel into the area frequently.

Three regional supervisor training meetings were held, directed by NORC personnel but also attended by SRI staff and, in some cases, by OE/Follow Through personnel. Each supervisor attended one of the training sessions and was then responsible for recruiting interviewers--if more were necessary--in her area. She held training sessions for new interviewers, using standard NORC training material and procedures, and then joint sessions for new and old interviewers to learn the procedures for this specific study. Close control over all supervisors was maintained by NORC. SRI has on file a complete set of all training material and of all directives sent to supervisors.

NORC was given responsibility for gaining entry into the community, using explicit procedures developed jointly by OE/Follow Through and SRI.* Gaining entry required not only obtaining general cooperation within the community but also obtaining addresses for parents from schools. The NORC supervisor was to notify both the Follow Through director and the PAC chairman of the impending study, although a number of PAC chairmen were not notified where the Follow Through director indicated it was not necessary to do so.

During the process of gaining entry, many problems arose, particularly with local authorities who wanted to preview the interview form. Complete notes were kept by all three organizations (SRI, NORC, OE/Follow Through) regarding all events and problems during the field period. Subsequently, the three sets of notes were synthesized into one file, available at SRI.

As a control on quality, NORC checked by phone or mail between 15 and 25% of the respondents to assure that the interview had taken place, the percentage varying in the different areas. The selection of interviews for this validation was random except that the first few interviews by each interviewer were validated. In addition to verifying the original interview and the answers to a few key questions in it, NORC asked some questions about the respondent's reaction to the interview. The validation forms were transmitted to SRI. Whenever a respondent refused the

---

* Dr. Robert Egbert, Director, Follow Through Program, sent a letter in December 1970 to all Follow Through directors, PAC chairmen, school superintendents and other interested persons. The letter explained the purpose of the PI survey and requested cooperation.

first attempt to interview, another interviewer (often the supervisor) recontacted the respondent and either obtained the interview or learned more about the reason for the refusal. These reports are also in SRI files. Of the original 15,284 cases NORC could locate, only 115 (well under 1%) refused to be interviewed. No variations in this low level of refusals was noted among the 49 communities; some of the individual problems in community relations are described later.

On April 1, 1970, a meeting was held at NORC's New York office with representatives of OE/Follow Through, SRI, and NORC. The purpose was to review the community entry procedures used, and to make recommendations for the future. A full transcription of this meeting is on file.

Data Processing

The completed interview forms were coded at NORC in accordance with specifications jointly developed by SRI and NORC. The codes for most of the open-ended questions were also jointly developed by SRI and NORC staff, at a meeting in New York. The two open-ended questions directly related to the parent's opinion of Follow Through* were specifically excluded from coding by NORC under its contractual time schedule. Instead, a sample of these responses was coded by SRI.

Once NORC had completed its coding tasks, it subcontracted the card punching to a nearby organization in New York. Because NORC uses relatively sophisticated card cleaning procedures, the punching was not verified, a lack unnoticed by SRI at the time. SRI often specifies 100% verification of all punching, and then uses relatively simple card cleaning procedures. The difference in procedures is based on a professional difference of opinion on "best" procedure, which was not totally resolved prior to the fact.

During the card cleaning phase, a number of difficulties were encountered by NORC, not all of which can be pinpointed or their impact measured. Several, however, can be identified:

---

* Question 76, "Thinking over all the things we've been talking about let's go back to Follow Through. What are the things you like most about Follow Through?" and Question 77, "And what are the things you don't like about Follow Through?"

1. The card cleaning program used for the PI had not been fully developed, tested, and applied in other studies prior to this one.

2. The card cleaning program was run at the Columbia University Computation Center, with the help of a highly qualified local consultant. However, he was not familiar with all the details of the specific program, and NORC subsequently brought to New York a member of its Chicago staff to work with him.

3. The machine used at Columbia and the one at the University of Chicago are not totally compatible, compounding programming difficulties.

4. The Columbia Center was temporarily closed as a result of student unrest, a further source of delay.

5. The NORC card cleaning program includes not only checks for improper punches but also internal checks for logic. However, the vital information used for identification of children and merging with other data on the same children in the project data bank was not subject to card cleaning procedures because there were few improper punches for which checks could be made and few logical checks that could be made. Hand checks were made but no machine checks (including verification of punching) were performed.

The results of such problems were twofold. First, delays were encountered in delivery of tapes to SRI. Second, the initial tapes received by SRI contained errors which had to be corrected. Nevertheless, the NORC tapes finally delivered to SRI are according to SRI specifications. The means by which the above problems can be reduced or eliminated have been and continue to be under discussion.

Some cross-tabulations--for first grade children only--were performed on data from the PI survey and data from the "Classroom Roster" that was filled in by teachers or other school personnel and used to identify children for achievement testing and other evaluation purposes. The sex and age of the child and ethnic origin are the three characteristics that could be compared easily. On these, agreement was very high.

Ethnic origin was not included as a direct question in the PI; rather, the interviewer filled in the ethnic origin of the respondent

after leaving the household, by checking one choice on the following list:

Caucasian--Mexican American
Caucasian--Puerto Rican
Caucasian--Other
Negro/Black
American Indian
Oriental
Other (SPECIFY)
Unknown.

Similar categories were used in the Classroom Roster to record the ethnic origin of the children, and may also have been filled in from personal observation in many cases. Even so, the agreement on ethnic origin was high--about 99% for blacks and 97% for whites (Caucasian--Other)--but there was a real problem in the Mexican American category. For the 39 respondents so classified in the PI survey, one of the children was classified as Puerto Rican in the Classroom Roster and the other 38 as white.

For coding questions 76 and 77--the parent's "likes" and "dislikes" about Follow Through--the respondents were grouped by sponsor and within the sponsors by grade level of the child. A sampling interval was chosen to yield approximately 50 respondents per sponsor, but all respondents were included for those sponsors with fewer than 50. This subsample of Follow Through parents totals 933.*

Standard content analysis procedures were used for developing codes for both questions. The categories were deliberately stated in broad terms to facilitate this data processing task:

- Question 76 ("likes")

  1. Curriculum (e.g., specific subjects taught, better preparation for next grade, field trips)

  2. Teaching (e.g., individual attention, teacher really cares about child)

---

* The analysis of these two questions was made to explore the usefulness of the responses. Therefore a minimum size sample was selected.

3. Services (such as lunches and snacks, medical and dental, college courses for parents, buses)

4. Social benefits to the child (social relations, feeling of worth, learns to play, improved self-concept)

5. Parent activities (activities for parents, school jobs, etc.)

- Question 77 ("dislikes")

1. Curriculum (more 3Rs, too much expected of child, hours too long)

2. Teaching method and philosophy (discipline inadequate, classes crowded, teacher or aides inadequate)

3. Organization and administration (inadequate pay for aides, lunchroom crowded, etc.)

It is not feasible, at this time, to merge these hand tallied responses with the computer tapes of responses to the other questions in the PI survey.

Response Rate and Community Relations

It has been previously noted that interviews were completed with a parent in 97% of the target families NORC could locate. A very high response rate was anticipated by NORC from its experience of other surveys in which parents were asked to talk about their children. Nevertheless, the high rate raises the question of whether the effort to complete interviews was too intensive, gaining the high response rate at the expense of good community relations. This does not seem to be the case although there were, inevitably, a few regrettable incidents and some negative reactions to the interview. For example, in response to question 77, the last one, "And what are the things you don't like about Follow Through?" one parent replied:

> "I don't like for them to send this lady out here with these papers asking about all this personal business and stuff."

And the interviewer of another parent noted that:

> "Respondent was skeptical about the interview. Respondent said she did not like surveys or answering questions. Respondent said she thought the questions in the interview were very personal. Respondent refused to answer question 70."

Question 70 (on the long form) is the only question concerning the family's income and refers only to the amount. It was expected to produce many more negative reactions than it did. In fact, several other questions about income could probably have been asked with little risk of negative reaction.

Some of the respondents appeared highly cooperative but rather nervous or confused about the purpose of the interview:

> "Respondent was interested and extremely cooperative. She made quite a few references to social workers and various other people who had visited with her recently. I got the distinct impression that she felt I was one of these people. She seemed over anxious to please, as if she feared some retaliatory measure."*

The high response rate may have been partially due to interviewer tolerance of difficult interviewing conditions:

> "A big dog took after me and scared me, and as I took the interview he sat beside me and tried to climb on my lap. Next the dog took after the cat and there was a big interruption . . . ."

> "This interview went off very well in spite of several interruptions. All six children were at home and awake. Interview had to be conducted in the living room with all of the children passing through at one time or another--to ask questions or to see if they could listen and answer the questions also. Mother rather firmly told them she was being questioned, not them, and to return to their own play. Neighbor also dropped in to visit . . . ."

---

* The problems of social work interviewing have been discussed with insight and sympathy by Bernard Beck, "Cooking Welfare Stew," in R. W. Havenstein, ed., Pathways to Data, Aldine, Chicago, 1970, especially pp. 19-27.

On the whole, the PI appears to have left community relations unchanged and, in some cases, possibly improved:

> "The respondent . . . was very friendly, and most cooperative. She offered to fix some lunch . . . . She talked about taking part in school activities and how she enjoyed being a homeroom mother in her son's classroom . . . . I enjoyed doing this particular interview . . . . We talked for a good while after the interview was done. She inquired about NORC and asked how I got this job. She sounded as if she would enjoy this."

Further evidence of parent interest in the PI survey developed in a community where the school authorities were very reluctant to permit parent interviewing and sent a letter asking the parents to phone or write in if they did not want to be interviewed. Most of those who made contact said they did want to be interviewed.

Certainly there is no evidence to suggest that the PI survey is creating any serious or lasting problems in community relations. However, a response rate of 97% is higher than needed for statistical purposes. Procedures for locating the respondent and completing the interview were eased off somewhat for the small parent survey conducted late in 1970 with little apparent effect on the response rate.

CONFIDENTIAL

4093
1/70

Approved through December 1, 1970

Form approved,
Budget Bureau No. 51-R-0807

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Menlo Park, California

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Parent Interview - Long Form

CODING NUMBER [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 01-05

DECK [0][1] 06-07

STUDY [4][0][9][3] 08-11

GRADE [ ] 12/

13/R

CHILD'S NAME: [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
14-29

RESPONDENT'S NAME: _____

RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD: _____ 30/9

ADDRESS: [ ]
31-53

CITY: [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
54-65

STATE: _____

ZIP CODE: [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
66-70

CASE NUMBER: _____

SRI ID NUMBER [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
71-80

DECKS 02-05

TIME BEGAN: _____ AM / PM

L

1. We'd like to know who lives here in your household. First, who is the head of the house? RECORD HEAD'S FIRST AND LAST NAMES ON LINE 01. Now let's list the rest of the household in order of age--oldest first. LIST FULL NAMES OF OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS, THEN ASK A THROUGH K AS THEY APPLY TO EACH ONE.

NAME	A. What was (PERSON)'s age on (his/her) last birthday? IF UNDER 12, RECORD MONTH & YEAR OF BIRTH	B. CODE SEX. MALE	B. CODE SEX. FEMALE	C. What is (PERSON)'s relationship to (HEAD)? RECORD RELATIONSHIP BELOW.	IF UNDER 20, ASK D: D. Is (PERSON) in school? Yes	IF UNDER 20, ASK D: D. Is (PERSON) in school? No	IF YES TO D & UNDER 12, ASK E: E. Is (CHILD) in any special school program? Yes	E. No (SKIP TO D)	IF YES TO E: F. What is the name of the program? HS	FT	Other (SPECIFY)
01	17-20/	1	2	HEAD	3	4	24-30/R				
	21/9			22/9	23/9						
02	31-34/	1	2	36/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	35/9				37/9		38/9		39/9		
03	45-48/	1	2	50/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	49/9				51/9		52/9		53/9		
04	59-62/	1	2	64/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	63/9				65/9		65/9		67/9		
05 BEGIN DECK 03	17-20/	1	2	22/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	21/9				23/9		24/9		25/9		
06	31-34/	1	2	36/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	35/9				37/9		38/9		39/9		
07	45-48/	1	2	50/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	49/9				51/9		52/9		53/9		
08	59-62/	1	2	64/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	63/9				65/9		66/9		67/9		
09 BEGIN DECK 04	17-20/	1	2	22/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	21/9				23/9		24/9		25/9		
10	31-34/	1	2	36/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	35/9				37/9		38/9		39/9		
11	45-48/	1	2	50/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	49/9				51/9		52/9		53/9		
12	59-62/	1	2	64/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	63/9				65/9		66/9		67/9		
13 BEGIN DECK 05	17-20/	1	2	22/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	21/9				23/9		24/9		25/9		
14	31-34/	1	2	36/9	3	4	5	6	1	2	3
	35/9				37/9		38/9		39/9		

HS OR FT NOT MENTIONED IN F, ASK G: G. (CHILD) in a ogram called Head art or one called llow Through?			IF IN HEAD START OR FOLLOW THROUGH, ASK H: H. How helpful is (Head Start/ Follow Through) to (CHILD)--would you say it is very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful at all?			FOR ALL CHILDREN IN SCHOOL, ASK I-K: I. What school does (CHILD) go to? RECORD NAME OF SCHOOL BELOW OR WRITE IN "DON'T KNOW."	J. What grade is (he/ she) in? RECORD GRADE BELOW.	K. And what is (his/ her) teacher's name? RECORD TEACHER'S NAME OR WRITE IN "DON'T KNOW."
ad art	Follow Through	Neither	Very	Some-what	Not at all			
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			41/9			42/9	43/9	44/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			55/9			56/9	57/9	58/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			69/9			70/9	71/9	72/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			27/9			28/9	29/9	30/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			41/9			42/9	43/9	44/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			55/9			56/9	57/9	58/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			69/9			70/9	71/9	72/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			27/9			28/9	29/9	30/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			41/9			42/9	43/9	44/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			55/9			56/9	57/9	58/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			69/9			70/9	71/9	72/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			27/9			28/9	29/9	30/9
4	5	6	1	2	3			
/9			41/9			42/9	43/9	44/9

TOTAL ☐☐ 45-46 91 CHILD ☐☐ 47-48

ASK EVERYONE:

2. Has (SAMPLE CHILD) always gone to (NAME OF SCHOOL)?
   Yes 1
   No . . (ASK A) . . 2 — 17/9

   A. IF NO: When did (CHILD) start at this school?
   ____ / ____ (Month) (Year) — 18-21/9999

IF FOLLOW THROUGH NOT MENTIONED IN Q. 1, ASK Q. 3:

3. (Before this interview,) Had you ever heard of Follow Through?
   Yes 1
   No (SKIP TO Q. 5) . 2 — 22/9

IF SAMPLE CHILD IS NOT MENTIONED AS IN FOLLOW THROUGH, ASK Q. 4:

4. Is (SAMPLE CHILD) in Follow Through?
   Yes 3
   No . . . . . 4 — 23/9

ASK EVERYONE:

5. Was (SAMPLE CHILD) ever in a preschool program such as Head Start?
   Yes 5
   No . . . . . 6 — 24/9

6. Since the beginning of this school year, have you (or your husband) visited (CHILD)'s classroom while the class was in session?
   Yes . . . . . 7 — 25/9
   No (SKIP TO Q. 9). 8

7. CODE WITHOUT ASKING IF ONLY ONE PARENT: Did you yourself go, did your husband go or did you both go together? RECORD BELOW IN COLUMN A.

	A. Yes	A. No		B. FOR EACH YES IN COLUMN A: Since school started this year, how many times did (you/your husband/you both) go?
R went	1	2	26/9	27-28/99
Spouse went	3	4	29/9	30-31/99
Both together	5	6	32/9	33-34/99

8. A. How did you happen to make the (last) visit--did the teacher ask you to come or did you yourself decide to go?
   Teacher asked 1
   Parent decided 2
   Other (SPECIFY) . . . . . 3 — 35/9

   B. ASK IF MORE THAN ONE VISIT IN Q. 7: And what about the next to last visit?
   Teacher asked 4
   Parent decided 5
   Other (SPECIFY) . . . . . 6 — 36/9

   C. ASK IF MORE THAN TWO VISITS IN Q. 7: And the visit before that?
   Teacher asked 7
   Parent decided 8
   Other (SPECIFY) . . . . . 0 — 37/9

9. Do you work regularly in (CHILD)'s classroom or elsewhere for (CHILD)'s school, either as a volunteer or as a paid worker?

Works for pay in (CHILD)'s classroom . . .	1	38/9
Is a volunteer in (CHILD)'s classroom . . .	2	
Works for pay elsewhere at (CHILD)'s school (SPECIFY)	3	
Is a volunteer elsewhere at (CHILD)'s school (SPECIFY)	4	
Does not work at (CHILD)'s school	5	

---

10. (Since the beginning of this school year,) Have you (or your husband) talked privately with (CHILD)'s teacher--that is, in a personal visit?

Yes	1	39/9
No . . (SKIP TO Q.14).	2	

---

11. How long ago was the last time--how many weeks or months ago?

Less than one week ago	1	40/9
One to less than 3 weeks ago	2	
Three weeks to less than 1 month ago	3	
One to less than 2 months ago	4	
Two to less than 3 months ago	5	
Three months ago or longer	6	

---

12. Where was this meeting with the teacher--was it at the school, at your home, or was it somewhere else?

School	1	41/9
Home	2	
Other (SPECIFY)	3	

---

13. Who suggested you get together the last time?

Parent	4	42/9
Teacher	5	
Child	6	
Both parent and teacher.	7	
Other (SPECIFY)	8	

---

14. Are there any things you would like to talk to (CHILD)'s teacher about?

Yes . . . (ASK A) . . .	1	43/9
No	2	

A. IF YES: What are some of these things? (PROBE: What other things?)

44/9
45/9
46/9
47/9

15. Have you (or your husband) talked privately with anyone else from (CHILD)'s school this year--either at home or at school?

Yes . .(ASK A). . . 3 17/9
No 4

A. IF YES: Who have you talked with?

Principal 5 18/9
Nurse/doctor/dentist . . . 6
Social worker 7
Other (SPECIFY) 8

---

16. How often does (CHILD) talk about what happens in school--would you say every day, several times a week, several times a month, or less often than that?

Every day 1 19/9
Several times a week . . . 2
Several times a month . . . 3
Less often 4

---

17. What are some of the things that (CHILD) especially likes about school? (PROBE: What other things?)

20-21/99
22-23/99
24-25/99
26-27/99

---

18. And what are some of the things that (he/she) dislikes about school? (PROBE: What other things?)

28-29/99
30-31/99
32-33/99
34-35/99

---

19. In general, how does (CHILD) feel about his teacher--would you say (he/she) likes the teacher a lot, (he/she) feels so-so about the teacher, or doesn't (he/she) like her at all?

Likes a lot 1 36/9
So-so 2
Doesn't like . . . 3

20. How often does (CHILD) bring home any work (he/she) has done at school? (READ CODE CATEGORIES.)

Every day	4	37/9
Several times a week	5	
Several times a month	6	
Less often than that	7	

21. How often does (CHILD) bring home any school work to be done at home? (READ CODE CATEGORIES.)

Every day	1	38/9
Several times a week	2	
Several times a month	3	
Less often than that	4	

22. In general, how satisfied are you with (CHILD)'s progress in school--are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, or are you not satisfied?

Very satisfied	5	39/9
Fairly satisfied (ASK A)	6	
Not satisfied . . (ASK A)	7	

A. IF NOT VERY SATISFIED: What would have to be different for you to be very satisfied?

40/9
41/9
42/9
43/9

23. Are there any groups of parents or organizations in your community that work with the schools?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	1	44/9
No	2	

A. IF YES: Who are they? CODE AS MANY AS APPLY.

CAP or CAA (Community Action Program or Agency)	3	45/9
PTA (Parent-Teachers Association) (PA)	4	46/9
PAC (Policy Advisory Committee)(SKIP TO Q. 25)	5	47/9
Other (SPECIFY)	6	48/9

49/9

24. Have you heard of a group called the Policy Advisory Committee, sometimes called the P.A.C. or PAC?

Yes	7	50/9
No . .(SKIP TO Q. 37). .	8	

---

25. Have you (or your husband) ever been a member of PAC?

Yes . (ASK A & B) . . .	1	51/9
No	2	

IF YES:

A. Are you (or your husband) now a member?

Yes	3	52/9
No	4	

B. (Are/Were) you (or he) a general member or (are/were) you (or he) a member of the executive committee or both?

General member	5	53/9
Executive committee . .	6	
Both	7	

---

26. Have you (or your husband) ever gone to the PAC general meetings?

Yes	1	54/9
No . . (ASK A) . .	2	

A. IF NO: Could you (or your husband) go to the general meetings if you wanted to?

Yes	3	55/9
No (ASK [1]) . .	4	

[1] IF NO TO A: Why is that? CODE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Meetings are for members only . . .	5	56/9
Babysitting problems	6	57/9
No time	7	58/9
Other reasons (SPECIFY)	8	59/9
		60/9

27. Have you ever gone to the PAC Executive Committee meetings?

Yes	1	61/9
No . .(ASK A) . . .	2	

A. IF NO: Could you (or your husband) go to the Executive Committee meetings if you wanted to?

Yes	3	62/9
No . (ASK [1]) . . .	4	

[1] IF NO TO A: Why is that? CODE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Meetings are for members only . . .	5	63/9
Babysitting problems	6	64/9
No time	7	65/9
Other reasons (SPECIFY)	8	66/9
		67/9

---

28. Do you happen to know any members of PAC?

Yes . . (ASK A) . . .	1	68/9
No	2	

A. IF YES: Have you ever talked to members of PAC about what goes on in meetings?

Yes . (ASK [1]) . .	3	69/9
No	4	

[1] IF YES TO A: What are some of the things you talked about?

70/9
71/9
72/9
73/9

29. How often does the PAC meet?

Weekly	1	17/9
Twice a month	2	
Once a month	3	
Several times a year	4	
Once a year or less	5	

---

30. How do people get to be members of PAC--are they elected, are they appointed, or can any parent join?

Elected	1	18/9
Appointed	2	
Any parent can join	3	
Other (SPECIFY)	4	

---

31. If you had a problem about the schools, could you get PAC to try to do something about it?

Yes	1	19/9
No	2	

---

32. What kinds of problems would you like to take to the PAC meetings?

20/9

21/9

22/9

23/9

33. Does PAC have anything to say about hiring teachers and aides?

Yes 3 24/9
No 4

34. Do they have anything to say about the way the school's money is spent?

Yes 5 25/9
No 6

35. Do they have anything to say about what the children are taught in school?

Yes 7 26/9
No 8

36. Do the PAC and the school board usually work together in trying to solve school problems?

Yes 1 27/9
No 2

ASK EVERYONE:

37. Do you happen to know how people get on the school board--are they elected, appointed, or can anyone join?

Elected 3 28/9
Appointed 4
Anyone can join . . 5
Other (SPECIFY) . . 6

38. Are you (or your husband) active in the PTA (PA), or any other parents' group--that is, do you attend meetings regularly?

Yes 7 29/9
No 8

39. Are you (or your husband) active in any (other) clubs or organizations that meet regularly?

Yes (ASK A & B) . . 1 30/9
No 2

IF YES:

A. What kinds of clubs or organizations are they? READ CODE CATEGORIES AND CODE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Social 3 31/9
Political 4 32/9
Church 5 33/9
Community 6 34/9
Other (SPECIFY) . . 7 35/9

36/9

B. Altogether, how many different groups is that?

Number of groups: _____ 37-38/99

40. Now I would like to have your opinion on some statements about parents and schools. As I read the statements, please look at this card (CARD B) and tell me if you strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement.

HAND CARD B

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
A. There's nothing parents can do to change the schools	1	2	3	4	39/9
B. In this community the parents have a say about how the schools are run	5	6	7	8	40/9
C. If the parents disagree with the teacher or the principal, there's nothing parents can do about it	1	2	3	4	41/9
D. In this community, people who run the schools really care about what parents think . .	5	6	7	8	42/9
E. People who run the schools really know what the parents want	1	2	3	4	43/9
F. If parents wanted something changed about the schools, there would be a good chance of getting it changed	5	6	7	8	44/9

41. Please tell me which of these two statements you believe is true for you. Don't tell me which one you would like to be true or should be true, but which one you believe is more true of you.

A.	Many of the unhappy things that happen to people are just plain bad luck . . . . . 1 or Many of the unhappy things that happen to people come from the mistakes they make 2	45/9
B.	Sooner or later, people get what they deserve in this world 3 or The sad part is, a person's true value isn't often noticed no matter how hard he tries 4	46/9
C.	I have found that what is going to happen, will happen . . 5 or I have found that it's better to plan ahead than to just let things happen 6	47/9
D.	If the child has studied his lessons every day, tests will not bother him very often . . . . . 7 or Tests often aren't related to classwork so there is no use studying 8	48/9
E.	Becoming successful is a matter of hard work, not luck . . 1 or Becoming successful depends a lot on being in the right place at the right time 2	49/9
F.	Most people don't realize how much their lives are controlled by things that happen by accident . . . . . 3 or There really is no such thing as "luck" 4	50/9
G.	The average citizen can change the government's way of doing things . . . . . 5 or This world is run by a few big shots, and there isn't much the little guy can do about it 6	51/9
H.	When I make plans, I am sure that I can make them work . . 7 or It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad luck anyhow 8	52/9
I.	In the long run, the bad things and the good things that happen to us are about 50-50 . . . . . 1 or Most "bad luck" comes to people because they are ignorant, lazy, have no ability, or all three 2	53/9
J.	Many times I feel that I can't do much about the things that happen to me . . . . . 3 or ____ Chance and luck are not important in my life 4	54/9

FOR Q'S. 42-63, READ THE CODE CATEGORIES WITH THE QUESTION.

42. How often do you take (CHILD) along when you go shopping--would you say ...

Daily	1	55/9
Weekly	2	
Monthly	3	
Less than once a month . .	4	
Never	5	

43. When you are working around your home, how often does (CHILD) help without being asked--would you say...

Very often	4	56/9
Quite often	5	
Sometimes	6	
Not often	7	
Never	8	

44. How often do you talk with (CHILD) about things (he/she) has seen on TV--would you say ...

Daily	1	57/9
Weekly	2	
Monthly	3	
Less than once a month . .	4	
Never	5	

45. If (CHILD) asks you a question you can't answer, how often do you try to find the answer by looking in a book--would you say ...

Always	4	58/9
Usually	5	
Once in a while	6	
Not often	7	
Never	8	

L

46. How much do you talk with (CHILD) at mealtime--would you say ... 59/9

A great deal 1
Quite a bit 2
Some 3
Just a little 4
Not much 5

---

47. How often does (CHILD) come to you for help on school work--would you say ... 60/9

Very often 4
Quite often 5
Sometimes 6
Not often 7
Never 8

---

48. How often do you tell (CHILD) that (he/she) has done good work at school--would you say ... 61/9

Very often 1
Quite often 2
Sometimes 3
Not often 4
Never 5

---

49. How often do you take (CHILD) on a trip out of town--would you say ... 62/9

Once a week 4
Once a month 5
A few times a year . . . 6
Less than once a year . 7
Never 8

---

50. How often does (CHILD) play school at home--would you say ... 63/9

Very often 1
Quite often 2
Sometimes 3
Not often 4
Never 5

---

51. How often does (CHILD) play that (he/she) is grown up--would you say ... 64/9

Very often 4
Quite often 5
Sometimes 6
Not often 7
Never 8

52. How often does (CHILD) play house--would you say ...

Very often	1	65/9
Quite often	2	
Sometimes	3	
Not often	4	
Never	5	

53. When (CHILD) has chance to choose what to do around the house, how often does (he/she) choose to look at a book or magazine--would you say ...

Almost every day	4	66/9
Often	5	
Once in a while	6	
Seldom	7	
Never	8	

54. If (CHILD) graduates from high school, what are (his/her) chances of getting a good job--would you say ...

Excellent	1	67/9
Good	2	
Fair	3	
Poor	4	
Very poor	5	

55. In general, what kind of grades do you expect (CHILD) to get as he goes through school--would you say ...

Excellent	4	68/9
Above average	5	
Average	6	
Below average	7	
Failing	8	

56. How much did you read to (CHILD) before (he/she) could read--would you say ...

A great deal	1	69/9
Quite a bit	2	
Some	3	
Just a little	4	
Not much	5	

57. How often do you take part in social activities in which about half of the people are of different ethnic or racial groups (for example: at church parties, etc.)--would you say ...

Once a week	4	70/9
Once a month	5	
A few times a year	6	
Less often than once a year.	7	
Never	8	

58. How often do you visit someone who is not related to you--would you say ...

Daily	1	71/9
Weekly	2	
Monthly	3	
Less than once a month	4	
Never	5	

BEGIN DECK 09

59. How often do you visit with friends who live in a different part of the city than you--would you say ...

Daily	4	17/9
Weekly	5	
Monthly	6	
Less than once a month	7	
Never	8	

60. How often does (CHILD) see you reading--would you say ...

Almost every day	1	18/9
Weekly	2	
Monthly	3	
Once or twice a year	4	
Never	5	

61. How many different newspapers do you buy regularly--would you say ...

One daily	4	19/9
One daily and one weekly	5	
One weekly	6	
More than one daily and weekly	7	
None	8	

IF FATHER OR FATHER SUBSTITUTE LIVES IN THE HOUSE, ASK Q.62. OTHERWISE, GO TO Q.63.

62. How often does (CHILD) help (his/her) father when he is working on some project--would you say ...

Very often	1	20/9
Quite often	2	
Sometimes	3	
Not often	4	
Never	5	

63. What chance does (HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD) have to get ahead in (his/her) job--would you say ...

Excellent	4	21/9
Good	5	
Fair	6	
Poor	7	
Very poor	8	

64. Do you take any magazines that come weekly or monthly?

Yes ... (ASK A)	1	22/9
No	2	

A. IF YES: How many?

Number of magazines: _____ 23-24/99

	(1) WRITE NAME OF HEAD BELOW AND ASK Q'S 65-68 ABOUT HEAD. HEAD'S NAME:	(2) IF SPOUSE OF HEAD IN HOUSEHOLD, WRITE NAME BELOW AND ASK Q'S 65-68 ABOUT HER. SPOUSE'S NAME:	(3) IF R IS NEITHER HEAD NOR SPOUSE OF HEAD, RECORD NAME BELOW AND ASK Q'S 65-68 ABOUT HER. R'S NAME:
65. Is (PERSON) employed or unemployed and looking for work?			
Employed	1 25/9	1 35/9	1 45/9
Looking for work .	2	2	2
Neither (SKIP TO Q. 67)	3	3	3
66. A. What kind of work does (PERSON) usually do? (PROBE IF VAGUE: What does [PERSON] actually do on that job?	26-28/999	36-38/999	46-48/999
B. What kind of business or industry is that? (PROBE IF VAGUE: What does that [firm/organization/ agency] make or do?)	29-31/999	39-41/999	49-51/999
67. How many of the last twelve months has (PERSON) been employed (it any)?	_____ months None 00 32-33/99	_____ months None 00 42-43/99	_____ months None 00 52-53/99
68. What is the highest grade in school (PERSON) completed?			
No schooling . . .	1 34/9	1 44/9	1 54/9
Kindergarten through 3rd grade . . .	2	2	2
4th through 6th grade	3	3	3
7th through 8th grade	4	4	4
High school, incomplete . . .	5	5	5
High school, complete	6	6	6
College, incomplete	7	7	7
College, complete	8	8	8

IF CHILD'S MOTHER OR MOTHER SUBSTITUTE HAS WORKED IN LAST 12 MONTHS AT ALL, ASK Q. 69.

69. Who takes care of (CHILD) when (you are/she is) working? CODE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Adult member of the household	1	55/9
Other member of the household	2	56/9
Other relative--not in household . .	3	57/9
Unrelated person--not in household .	4	58/9
School	5	59/9
Child care center	6	60/9
Other (SPECIFY)	7	61/9
		62/9

---

70. Which of the groups on this card includes your total household income for last year--that is, 1969? Just tell me the letter for the amount that fits.

HAND CARD A

A. Under $1,000	1	63/9
B. $1,000 - $2,999	2	
C. $3,000 - $4,999	3	
D. $5,000 - $7,499	4	
E. $7,500 - $9,999	5	
F. $10,000 or more	6	

Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about this (house/apartment).

71. How many rooms do you have? (Do not count bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, or half rooms.)

Number of rooms: _____ 64-65/99

---

72. How many rooms are used for sleeping in this (house/apartment)?

Number of rooms: _____ 66-67/99

---

73. Do you own or rent this (house/apartment)?

Own	4	68/9
Rent	5	

---

74. How long have you lived at this address?

Number of months: _____ 69-70/99

or

Number of years: _____ 71-72/99

IF LESS THAN 12 MONTHS IN Q. 74 , ASK Q. 75 .

75. How many different houses or apartments have you lived in during the last year--including this (house/apartment)?

Number of places: _____ 17-18/99

IF RESPONDENT NEVER HEARD OF FOLLOW THROUGH, DO NOT ASK Q'S 76 & 77. (IF NO TO Q. 3)

76. Thinking over all the things we've been talking about, let's get back to Follow Through. What are the things you like most about Follow Through? (PROBE: What other things do you like about it?)

19-20/99

21-22/99

23-24/99

25-26/99

77. And what are the things you don't like about Follow Through? (PROBE: What other things don't you like about it?)

27-28/99

29-30/99

31-32/99

33-34/99

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. You have been very helpful.

TIME ENDED: _____ AM PM

INTERVIEWER REMARKS: FILL IN ITEMS BELOW AFTER YOU LEAVE THE HOUSEHOLD.

A. Is this household in public housing?

Yes 1
No 2

35/9

B. CODE TYPE OF STRUCTURE IN WHICH HOUSEHOLD IS LOCATED:

Single-family house, detached 3
Two-family house, semi-attached or attached row house 4
Apartment in apartment building 5
Apartment in partly business building . . 6
Mobile home (trailer) 7
Other (SPECIFY) 8

36/9

C. Respondent is:

Caucasian--Mexican American 1
Caucasian--Puerto Rican . . 2
Caucasian--Other 3
Negro/Black 4
American Indian 5
Oriental 6
Other (SPECIFY) 7
Unknown 8

37/9

D. What language is spoken predominately by the respondent?

English 1
Spanish 2
Other (SPECIFY) 3

38/9

E. Total length of interview in minutes:

[ ][ ][ ]

39-41/999

F. Date of interview:

[ ][ ][ ][ ]
Month Day

42-45/9999

G. Interviewer's signature:

H. Interviewer's number:

[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

46-50/99999

I. Number of calls required to complete this interview:

		51-52/99

J. Comments:

CONFIDENTIAL

4093
1/70

Approved through Dec. 1, 1970

Form approved,
Budget Bureau No. 51-R0807

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Menlo Park, California

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Parent Interview - Short Form

CODING NUMBER [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 01-05

DECK [0][1] 06-07

STUDY [4][0][9][3] 08-11

GRADE [ ] 12/

13/R

CHILD'S NAME: [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
14-29

RESPONDENT'S NAME: _____

RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD: _____ 30/9

ADDRESS: [ ]
31-53

CITY: [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
54-65

STATE: _____

ZIP CODE: [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
66-70

CASE NUMBER: _____

SRI ID NUMBER [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
71-80

TIME BEGAN: _____ AM / PM

We'd like to know who lives here in your household. First, who is the head of the house? RECORD HEAD'S FIRST AND LAST NAMES ON LINE 01. Now let's list the rest of the household in order of age--oldest first. LIST FULL NAMES OF OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS, THEN ASK A THROUGH D AS THEY APPLY TO EACH ONE.

NAME	A. What was (PERSON)'s age on (his/her) last birthday? IF UNDER 12, RECORD MONTH & YEAR OF BIRTH	B. CODE SEX. MALE	B. CODE SEX. FEMALE	C. What is (PERSON)'s relationship to (HEAD)? RECORD RELATIONSHIP BELOW.	IF UNDER 20, ASK D: D. Has (PERSON) been in a program at school called Head Start or Follow Through? Head Start	Follow Through	Neither
01	17-20	1 21	2	HEAD 22	3 23	4	5
02	24-27	1 28	2	29	3 30	4	5
03	31-34	1 35	2	36	3 37	4	5
04	38-41	1 42	2	43	3 44	4	5
05	45-48	1 49	2	50	3 51	4	5
06	52-55	1 56	2	57	3 58	4	5
07	59-62	1 63	2	64	3 65	4	5
08	66-69	1 70	2	71	3 72	4	5
09 BEGIN DECK 03	17-20	1 21	2	22	3 23	4	5
10	24-27	1 28	2	29	3 30	4	5
11	31-34	1 35	2	36	3 37	4	5
12	38-41	1 42	2	43	3 44	4	5
13	45-48	1 49	2	50	3 51	4	5
14	52-55	1 56	2	57	3 58	4	5

TOTAL [ ][ ] 59-60 CHILD [ ][ ] 61-62

	(1) WRITE NAME OF HEAD BELOW AND ASK Q'S 2-5 ABOUT HEAD. HEAD'S NAME:	(2) IF SPOUSE OF HEAD IN HOUSEHOLD, WRITE NAME BELOW AND ASK Q'S 2-5 ABOUT HER. SPOUSE'S NAME:	(3) IF R IS NEITHER HEAD NOR SPOUSE OF HEAD, RECORD NAME BELOW AND ASK Q'S 2-5 ABOUT HER. R'S NAME:
2. Is (PERSON) employed or unemployed and looking for work?			
Employed	1 17/9	1 27/9	1 37/9
Looking for work .	2	2	2
Neither (SKIP TO Q. 4)	3	3	3
3. A What kind of work does (PERSON) usually do? (PROBE IF VAGUE: What does [PERSON] actually do on that job?	18-20/999	28-30/999	38-40/999
B. What kind of business or industry is that? (PROBE IF VAGUE: What does that [firm/organization/ agency] make or do?)	21-23/999	31-33/999	41-43/999
4. How many of the last twelve months has (PERSON) been employed (if any)?	_____ months None 00 24-25/99	_____ months None 00 34-35/99	_____ months None 00 44-45/99
5. What is the highest grade in school (PERSON) completed?			
No schooling . . .	1 26/9	1 36/9	1 46/9
Kindergarten through 3rd grade . . .	2	2	2
4th through 6th grade	3	3	3
7th through 8th grade	4	4	4
High school, incomplete . . .	5	5	5
High school, complete	6	6	6
College, incomplete	7	7	7
College, complete	8	8	8

IF CHILD'S MOTHER OR MOTHER SUBSTITUTE HAS WORKED IN LAST 12 MONTHS AT ALL; ASK Q. 6.

6. Who takes care of (CHILD) when (you are/she is) working? CODE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Adult member of the household	1	47/9
Other member of the household	2	48/9
Other relative--not in household . .	3	49/9
Unrelated person--not in household .	4	50/9
School	5	51/9
Child care center	6	52/9
Other (SPECIFY)	7	53/9
		54/R

FOR Q'S. 7-19, READ THE CODE CATEGORIES WITH EACH QUESTION.

7. How often do you take (CHILD) along when you go shopping--would you say ...

Daily	1	55/9
Weekly	2	
Monthly	3	
Less than once a month . .	4	
Never	5	

---

8. How often do you talk with (CHILD) about things (he/she) has seen on TV--would you say ...

Daily	1	56/9
Weekly	2	
Monthly	3	
Less than once a month . .	4	
Never	5	

---

9. If (CHILD) asks you a question you can't answer, how often do you try to find the answer by looking in a book--would you say ...

Always	4	57/9
Usually	5	
Once in a while	6	
Not often	7	
Never	8	

---

10. How much do you talk with (CHILD) at mealtime--would you say ...

A great deal	1	58/9
Quite a bit	2	
Some	3	
Just a little	4	
Not much	5	

11. How often do you tell (CHILD) that (he/she) has done good work at school--would you say ...

Very often	1	59/9
Quite often	2	
Sometimes	3	
Not often	4	
Never	5	

---

12. How often do you take (CHILD) on a trip out of town--would you say ...

Once a week	4	60/9
Once a month	5	
A few times a year	6	
Less than once a year . . .	7	
Never	8	

---

13. How often does (CHILD) play school at home--would you say ...

Very often	1	61/9
Quite often	2	
Sometimes	3	
Not often	4	
Never	5	

---

14. When (CHILD) has chance to choose what to do around the house, how often does (he/she) choose to look at a book or magazine--would you say ...

Almost every day	4	62/9
Often	5	
Once in a while	6	
Seldom	7	
Never	8	

---

15. In general, what kind of grades do you expect (CHILD) to get as he goes through school--would you say ...

Excellent	4	63/9
Above average	5	
Average	6	
Below average	7	
Failing	8	

16. How often do you take part in social activities in which about half of the people are of different ethnic or racial groups (for example: at church parties, etc.)--would you say ...

Once a week	4	64/9
Once a month	5	
A few times a year	6	
Less often than once a year	7	
Never	8	

---

17. How often do you visit with friends who live in a different part of the city than you--would you say ...

Daily	4	65/9
Weekly	5	
Monthly	6	
Less than once a month	7	
Never	8	

---

18. How many different newspapers do you buy regularly--would you say ...

One daily	4	66/9
One daily and one weekly	5	
One weekly	6	
More than one daily and weekly	7	
None	8	

IF FATHER OR FATHER SUBSTITUTE LIVES IN THE HOUSE, ASK Q.19; OTHERWISE, GO TO Q.20.

19. How often does (CHILD) help (his/her) father when he is working on some project--would you say ...

Very often	1	67/9
Quite often	2	
Sometimes	3	
Not often	4	
Never	5	

---

20. Do you take any magazines that come weekly or monthly?

Yes ... (ASK A)	1	68/9
No	2	

A. IF YES: How many?

Number of magazines: _____ 69-70/99

21. Which group on this card includes your total household income for 1969? Just tell me which letter includes the amount.

HAND CARD A

A. Under $1,000 . . . . . 1 17/9
B. $1,000 - $2,999 2
C. $3,000 - $4,999 3
D. $5,000 - $7,499 4
E. $7,500 - $9,999 5
F. $10,000 or more 6

Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about this (house/apartment).

22. How many rooms do you have? (Do not count bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, or half rooms.)

Number of rooms: _____ 18-19/99

---

23. How many rooms are used for sleeping in this (house/apartment)?

Number of rooms: _____ 20-21/99

---

24. Do you own or rent this (house/apartment)?

Own 4 22/9
Rent 5

---

25. How long have you lived at this address?

Number of months: _____ 23-24/99
or
Number of years: _____ 25-26/99

IF LESS THAN 12 MONTHS IN Q. 25, ASK Q. 26.

26. How many different houses or apartments have you lived in during the last year--including this (house/apartment)?

Number of places: _____ 27-28/99

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.
You have been very helpful.

TIME ENDED: _____ AM PM

INTERVIEWER REMARKS: FILL IN ITEMS BELOW AFTER YOU LEAVE THE HOUSEHOLD.

A. Is this household in public housing? Yes 1 29/9
No 2

B. CODE TYPE OF STRUCTURE IN WHICH HOUSEHOLD IS LOCATED: 30/9

Single-family house, detached 3
Two-family house, semi-attached or attached row house 4
Apartment in apartment building 5
Apartment in partly business building . . . 6
Mobile home (trailer) 7
Other (SPECIFY) 8

C. Respondent is: 31/9

Caucasian - Mexican American 1
Caucasian - Puerto Rican 2
Caucasian - Other 3
Negro/Black 4
American Indian 5
Oriental 6
Other (SPECIFY) 7
Unknown 8

D. What is the language spoken predominately by the respondent? 32/9

English 1
Spanish 2
Other (SPECIFY) . 3

INTERVIEWER REMARKS (Continued)

E. Interviewer's name: _____ 33-37/99999

F. Interviewer's number: ☐☐☐☐☐ 38-41/9999

G. Date of Interview: _____ 42-44/999

H. Length of interview in minutes: ☐☐☐ 45-46/99

I. Number of calls required to complete this interview: ☐☐

J. Comments:

Annex B-3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Political and Social Science, "Evaluating the War on Poverty," September 1969

Butler, Annie L., "Current Research in Early Childhood Education: A Compilation and Analysis for Program Planners," 1970

Cooley, Charles H., "Social Process," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1922

Datta, Lois-ellin, "Head Start Influence on Community Change," Children, Vol. 17, Nos. 193-196, September-October 1970

Department of Education and Science, "Children and their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)," 1967

Durrett, M. E., "Attitudinal Outcomes of 8 Weeks Head Start Teacher Training Programs with Parental Attitude Research Instrument," Childhood Education, Vol. 46, Nos. 115-117, November 1969

Educational Testing Service, "Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children," Edith Grotberg, ed., Proceeding of six Head Start Research Seminars held under OEO Contract 4098, 1969

"Equal Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review, 1969

Flandy, et al., "Effect of Unwanted Father Absence in Cognitive Development," Child Development, Vol. 40, Nos. 941-944, September 1969

Freeberg, Norman E., and Donald T. Payne, "Parental Influence on Cognitive Development in Early Childhood: A Review," Educational Testing Service, Child Development, Vol. 38 (1967), pp. 65-87

Gallup, George, "The Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1970, pp. 97-112

Gordon, J. J., "Reaching the Young Child Through Parent Education," Childhood Education, Vol. 46, No. 247, February 1970

Hand, H. C., "What People Think About Their Schools," World Book Co., New York, 1948

Havenstein, R. W., ed., "Pathways to Data," Aldine, Chicago, 1970, pp. 19-27

Maccoby, Eleanor E., and Miriam Zellner, "Experiments in Primary Education, Aspects of Project Follow Through," Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970

McDill, Edward L. and Mary S., and J. Timothy Sprehe, "Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education: An Appraisal of Evaluation Research," The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969

Miller, W. H., "Role of the Family in Underachievement," Journal of Sch. Psychology, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 48-53

Sharrock, A. M., "Aspects of Communication between Schools and Parents," Educational Research, Vol. 12, No. 194, June 1970

Sharrock, A., "Relations Between Home and School," Educational Research, Vol. 10, Nos. 185-196, June 1968

Slaughter, D. T., "Material Antecedents of the Academic Achievement to Behaviors of Afro-American Head Start Children," Educational Research, Vol. 48, Nos. 24-28, Fall 1969

Sugarman, Jules, "The 4-C Program," Children, Vol. 16, Nos. 76-77, March-April 1969

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Child Development, Summary of the Child Development Task Force Report," April 1968

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Education of the Disadvantaged, An Evaluative Report on Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," Fiscal Year 1968

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "A National Survey of the Impacts of Head Start Centers on Community Institutions," prepared for Project Head Start, Kirschner Associates, Inc., May 1970

"The Uses of Sociology," Paul F. Lazarsfeld, William H. Sewell, and Harold L. Wilensky, eds., Basic Books, Inc., 1967

Willman, B., "Parent Participation as a Factor in Effectiveness of Head Start Program," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 62, Nos. 406-410, May 1969

Wilson, Alan, Richmond Youth Project, Technical Report No. 3, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1967